THE CHURCHMAN.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15.

VOL. VI. No. 52. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1837. WHOLE NUMBER, 312.

From Wordsworth's Poems.

Places of Worship.

As star that shines resplendent upon star
Is to the sky when we look up in love;
As to the deep, fair ships, which though they move,
Seem fixed, to eyes that watch them from afar;
As to the sandy desert fountains are,
With palm groves shaded at wide intervals,
Whose fruit around the sun-burn'd native falls,
Of roving tired or desultory war;
Such to this British isle the Christian fanes,
Each linked to each for kindred services;
Her spires, her steeple-towers with glittering vanes
Far kenned, her chapels lurking among trees,
Where a few villagers on bended knees
Find solace which a busy world disdains.

Pastoral Character.

A GENIAL hearth, a hospitable board,
And a refined rusticity, belong
To the neat mansion, where his flock among
Their learned pastor dwells, their watchful lord,
Though meek and patient as a sheathed sword,
Though pride's least lurking thought appear a wrong
To human kind; though peace be on his tongue,
Gentleness in his heart; can earth afford
Such genuine state, pre-eminence so free,
As when arrayed in CHRIST's authority,
He from the pulpit lifts his awful hand;
Conjures, implores, and labors all he can
For resubjecting to divine command
The stubborn spirit of rebellious man?

THE CHURCHMAN.

From the Protestant Episcopalian.

CASE OF THE CHURCHES IN WISCONSIN.

A POINT of much interest to our Church has arisen in the North-west. Part of the new Territory of Wisconsin belonged to the Territory of Michigan when the latter was formed into a diocese; it has recently been made civilly independent of the State of Michigan. Does this fact involve its ecclesiastical independence? Does that part of Wisconsin belong to the Diocese of Bishop M'Coskry? That excellent prelate brought the subject before his Convention in his primary address; and the Gambier Observer has embarked in the discussion, seconded by the Southern Churchman and the Chronicle of the Church. They all maintain that the civil separation does not involve ecclesiastical severance. In the judgment of the present writer, they are mistaken—he speaks with all respect and deference—such, however, is his opinion. Not that he would allege that in all cases the civil creates the ecclesiastical independence, though something very like that proposition is affirmed in the preface to our Prayer-book: "When, in the course of divine Providence, these American States became independent, with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included;" but he would apply that maxim, which is universally true of nations foreign to each other, to States like ours, making one nation, as far as can be done with safety. It is a good maxim for such positions in our affairs, so long as it is left free from practical abuses, and so long as we make our state limits the limits of our dioceses. It has, moreover, been acted upon by us, tacitly, in several instances, and always beneficially, though, from its silent operation, the benefit has not, perhaps, been adequately appreciated.

I purpose, in this article, following up the discussion of the Wisconsin case, which has already been begun. And to open it to the reader, I present first an extract from the address of the much-loved prelate already mentioned, by none loved more than by myself, and from whose opinions no one can dissent with greater regret.

"Since the organization of Michigan into a state, and her supposed admission as such into union with the United States, the clergymen officiating at Green Bay, Navarino, and Winnebago, have thought that their connexion with this Diocese had ceased. This, however, I apprehend, is not the case. These places are embraced in the Diocese of Michigan. For although the limits of a state are generally to be considered as the limits of a diocese about to be formed, yet a diocese having been organized, and existing, prior to such civil arrangements, cannot be in any way affected, or its limits abridged. This can only be done by ecclesiastical provision. The Church recognises no connexion with, nor interference on the part of, the civil government. Merely for convenience, she takes the limits of States as the limits of her dioceses; and if it happen that the latter are formed prior to the former, it can in no way limit the jurisdiction or abridge the rights of her bishops. If so, the civil government would have complete control over our ecclesiastical rights, and a union virtually be formed, which all would deprecate and deplore. Every diocesan might (if the civil government thought fit) be shorn of his jurisdiction, and our Church forced to increase the number of her bishops, not to suit the convenience, or out of regard to the wants of her members, but to keep pace with civil enactments. I have felt it my duty, under existing circumstances, to present my views of this subject to this Convention, as I intend to exercise my episcopal functions in every part originally embraced under the Diocese of Michigan, until its limits are narrowed down by the proper authority. If the opinion advanced be wrong, it will, when I am convinced of it, be speedily changed. My only desire is to have the subject noticed, and views solicited from those who have long been conversant with the affairs of our Church. I hope, by the blessing of GOD, to visit the places alluded to in the coming year. They are too remote to be long connected with this Diocese, and I shall be most happy in acceding to any plan which may secure to them more frequent episcopal visitation, and be the means of building them up in the faith of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST."

To lay before the reader all that has been published on this side of the question, so far as I know, I add the remarks of the Gambier Observer, as transferred, with an expression of "concurrence," to the Southern Churchman. They are penned with great clearness and force.

"A subject of no little importance, as connected with diocesan limitations, is introduced —*that of the ecclesiastical relations of the churches in the Territory of Wisconsin*. It is well known that, but a short time ago, that country was included under the territorial government, and made a part of the territory of Michigan. Before any separation had taken place, the Diocese of Michigan was organized, and of course included all then known under the name of Michigan. Wisconsin, therefore, was then a part of that Diocese. Recently, however, a new territory has been formed, consisting of so much of the region once identified with Michigan as has been usually known as Wisconsin. The clergy of that region seem to have taken it for granted, that because this change of civil relations had taken place, their ecclesiastical position had also been changed—that, because no longer under the civil, they were no longer under the spiritual jurisdiction of Michigan. Before the consecration of Bishop M'Coskry, and before his election was ascertained, they applied to be received as part of the charge of the Missionary Bishop, Dr. Kemper. How far this was right—how far the duties of the Bishop of Michigan should be considered as connecting him with the Church in Wisconsin—was a question of much importance, which would naturally present itself to Dr. M'Coskry immediately upon entering on his work—one, indeed, which he could not avoid taking into serious consideration. It is evident that he considers Wisconsin as just as much connected with the Diocese of Michigan as ever—on the ground, that having once been a part of that Diocese, no mere alteration of civil relations by the government of the United States could have taken it away. No authority but of the Church, in General Convention, could authorize a separation. In this opinion we fully agree, and suppose it has only to be considered a single moment to be acknowledged by any one. It would be a singular position, indeed, that our Church would be in, if, without any connection with the state, the jurisdictions, the duties, and responsibilities of her bishops were subjected to its common legislation; so that, without any reference to the interests of the Church, a bill in Congress, defining the bounds of a new territory, should be also a law in the General Convention, circumscribing the visitations of its former Diocesan. Should an act of civil legislation divide Pennsylvania into two states, we question whether the Bishop of Pennsylvania would take it for granted that, without any act of the General Convention, all Pennsylvania were not still his Diocese."

In these two paragraphs we have probably all that can be said in favor of the views they maintain. And all hinges on the one topic—the impropriety, or rather the danger, of allowing the civil powers, by defining state limits, to define indirectly those of dioceses. Let me dispose of this difficulty, as the first point of my argument.

If our civil authorities ever changed or adjusted a boundary line, with the object of interfering in ecclesiastical affairs, the objection would be relevant, and even formidable. But they do no such thing, and are not likely to do it, till the fundamental principles of our government are changed. Hence the objection appears to me to be of no force, and indeed not to be relevant in the practical view. Our civil rulers act in these matters for civil purposes only; ecclesiastical affairs are not thought of; they weigh not a feather in these questions; such a subject as the limits of dioceses is probably not comprehended by the majority of them: and if it were, what could the civil powers of the United States gain by legislating bishops out of their dioceses, or by breaking these up into small ones? Or what could they gain by dividing a state into two or more, in order to disparage a bishop? Nothing, nothing whatever. The whole matter is insignificant in the political world; and neither the representatives nor the people, whether of a state or of the Union, would allow such an object to be even a part of the reasons for so important a public measure as the adjustment of a disputed boundary, or the division of one of the members of our confederacy. There is no motive, therefore, for any such proceeding; and without a motive, it is not to be expected—it is not a subject for the least apprehension. And as no state (proper) has ever been divided, and none is very likely to be, ecclesiastical trouble from that cause need be little feared, whether by the Church, or by the Bishop of Pennsylvania. The civil powers have done nothing as yet bearing on this subject, except to set off appendages to certain states, and to adjust boundaries; both which are needful acts, done for the common good, not wantonly, and should be recognised, as a matter of course, by the Church, so long as she regards her dioceses as defined by state limits. Should it be deemed expedient, by the civil authorities, at some future day, to divide any of the states, or to give them new boundaries, not for religious purposes, since that is utterly improbable, but through some political or secular motive, in such a case the Church will be notified in ample season, for it cannot be effected without much discussion; and she can meet the exigence by legislating on the mode of changing the limits of diocesan jurisdiction. But until that period, which may never arrive, the rule mentioned will prove sufficient. It is recognised in our Prayer-book; it has governed, as we shall see, our past practice, and worked well; and no abuse of it need be apprehended from any changes likely to occur.

Let us, for fancy's sake, imagine a plan to be seriously broached for the division of one of the states; and let us, to be doubly fanciful, suppose that, among the motives for the division intermingles that of an interference with the diocese or bishop of that state: this part of the scheme will prove altogether nugatory. First, the people of the state are to discuss the proposition; which discusssion will include so much local feeling, and local and probably general politics, that it will certainly be protracted long, with almost every chance that the plan will not be agreed upon. Next, if so far carried, it goes to Congress; and here the great politicians make their calculations concerning the effect of the measure on the distribution of power, and on presidential elections; and if the measure pass this ordeal, it will have a singular fortune: probably no measure of the kind will ever pass it, unless a second state should apply at the same time, so as to neutralize the political results. Well, the Church knows in full time the progress of so tardy a business, and the General Convention, to be prepared for the expected ecclesiastical exigence, declares that the division of a state shall not, of itself, produce the division of a diocese. Is the diocese or the bishop still at the mercy of the civil power? Can either of the new states so formed ordain (such an act of legislation must of course be general) that ministers or bishops who are not its citizens shall not exercise their functions within its limits? Not without coming into direct collision with much of the missionary system of most denominations—with the Pope's claim of jurisdiction, as held by the Romanists—with the operations of the Methodist itinerants and bishops, so called—with those of the Presbyterian evangelists, and with those of the travelling preachers among the Friends. In other words, the greater part of the religious community is to be disobliged, in order to inflict discredit on one portion of the Episcopal Church and its chief officer. What politician would venture on such a project? What politician, should he be ever so angry with his Episcopal neighbors, nay, should his anger be ever so just, would dare thus extensively to outrage feelings which would make their retaliation the forfeiture of all his ambitious hopes? The whole fear of the interference of the civil power with our bishops and dioceses is groundless.

May it not, then, be assumed, that, as our civil affairs now stand, there is no need of any action of the Church on this subject? And may it not be asked, what other ground could she act upon, than to conform the diocesan to the state boundaries? We are not speaking of the case of dividing a large diocese, the proposition in regard to which now before the Church so far recognises state limits, that the new jurisdictions to be formed are not to pass them. We are not speaking of the formation of a diocese out of "parts of dioceses" already formed, which, I think unfortunately, is part of the proposition before the Church; which, if carried, will be an innovation on our past practice; but which has no connexion with changes of civil boundaries. The Wisconsin case arises out of a change of this sort, and the present argument concerns it and similar ones, should they occur. In such cases, then, I ask, On what other ground could the General Convention determine the ecclesiastical boundary than that of making it conform to the civil? I cannot imagine any other *real* ground that would be alleged; though it is not difficult to suppose others that would not be openly declared, but cloaked under some specious pretext; and such grounds would produce unholy strife, and might lead to an unholy decision. If, then, no other rule can be made, let this continue to govern as it has hitherto.

That we have been governed by this rule, tacitly acknowledged, will appear by adverting to several facts in our national and church history.

The State of Connecticut had, by the royal charter, a claim to the northern portion of what is now the State of Ohio. Whether the claim was asserted, and to what extent, I am not certain. The western territory, called afterward the Territory north-west of the Ohio, including this region, was erected by Congress, in 1789, five years after Connecticut had a bishop. But the idea of his having jurisdiction over the tract thus made civilly independent of that State was never entertained. Why not? Or why did the General Convention of 1817 permit Ohio to elect a bishop, without first declaring it to be ecclesiastically separated from Connecticut? No reason can be assigned but the tacit operation of the principle for which I argue.

Virginia once owned and governed, as the Cumberland district or county, what is now Kentucky. It was separated from Virginia in December, 1790, five years after the latter was organized as a diocese, and just after it obtained a bishop: another authority says, in 1786,* one year after Virginia had become a diocese. If the civil separation did not include the separation from the diocese, what has produced it? Certainly no act of the General Convention. That body, in 1829, admitted the Church in Kentucky into its union; but Cumberland county was in union before, as a part of Virginia; how, then, could the same region be received into union again, but on the principle that its civil separation from Virginia had severed it from our Church union?

Vermont was formerly claimed by both New York and New Hampshire. The British government decided in favor of the former; but she afterward relinquished her right, and then Vermont was received as one of the United States in 1791. This was four years after New York had a bishop; yet neither he nor any one else imagined that he had jurisdiction over Vermont. On what principle, but that the civil independence involved the ecclesiastical? The Church in Vermont appears to have been received into union with the General Convention in 1811, (see Bioren, p. 268,) when it was represented in that body for the first time. Why *then* received, if its separation from the State of New York did not include its separation from that Diocese?

The strongest case is that of Maine. As part of the Diocese of Massachusetts, it was in union with the General Convention from October 2, 1789; and it formed part of the jurisdiction of Bishop Bass, in 1797, and afterward of Bishop Parker and Bishop Griswold. It was part of the Eastern Diocese from the time of its formation. In 1820, Maine became a separate State. Now mark the effect of its civil severance from Massachusetts on its ecclesiastical relations! It ceased to belong to the Eastern Diocese; and hence, in the report on the state of the Church in the General Convention of 1820, (p. 22,) it is said of its congregations, "They are *again* annexed to the Eastern Diocese." It ceased to be in union with the General Convention; and hence it was *again* received into union, on the 18th of May, 1820. (pp. 10, 11, 51, 52.) Bishop Griswold ceased to have jurisdiction over it; and hence its churches were placed *anew* under his care: at its first Convention, held May 3d, 1820, it was "*voted*, that the Right Rev. Bishop of the Eastern Diocese be requested to exercise episcopal jurisdiction over the churches of this State." (Christian Journal, vol. iv. p. 218.) This, its primary Convention, was held less than a fortnight before the General Convention was to assemble, and "agreeably to the recommendation of the Right Rev. Bishop Griswold;" the holding of it, and its enacting a constitution and canons, implied ecclesiastical separation from Massachusetts; the request to Bishop Griswold implied separation from both that and the Eastern Diocese, and of the congregations (not the clergy) from his jurisdiction; the application to the General Convention implied separation from that body. And what produced all these effects, but the civil severance from Massachusetts? If the interposition of the General Convention was necessary, or even proper, in the case, why did that assembly pass no censure on the proceedings, and tell Maine she ought to have waited a fortnight? Instead of this, they admit the new diocese into union, as the first act of the two Houses, and record the substance of what had been done there, in the report on the state of the Church. Nothing short of a vote of positive approbation could show more decidedly that the General Convention saw nothing to condemn.

All the cases I have adduced have a bearing on that of Wisconsin, and that of Maine covers even more ground. Massachusetts had long been a diocese, recognised as such for thirty-one years, and had had three bishops, before Maine became a state and a distinct diocese. Michigan had been a diocese between three and four years, and had no bishop when Wisconsin was made a territory. The clergy of Wisconsin, after it was a territory, and before the election of the Bishop of Michigan was complete, while, indeed, its completion was doubtful, requested another bishop to give them episcopal services,—thus intimating in full season that they held their churches to be separated from the Diocese of Michigan. Surely they were right. If they were not, Maine still belongs to the Diocese of Massachusetts, Kentucky to that of Virginia, Vermont to that of New York, and part of Ohio to that of Connecticut; nay, more, the General Convention has made blunder after blunder, in recognising these new dioceses, before separating them from the old ones respectively. Nor are these all the consequences of denying the correctness of the Wisconsin proceedings. When Michigan became a diocese, she had not the additional region now given her in exchange for Wisconsin: this ought, as a matter of course, to be under the jurisdiction of her bishop; but it is not, if the Wisconsin clergy are wrong. Till within a year, a tract lying between Ohio and Michigan was in dispute; it was then adjudged to Ohio; and it ought, of course, to belong to that diocese; but if the Wisconsin clergy are wrong, its ecclesiastical relation is yet undetermined; and to determine it, otherwise than on the principle named, polemical troops must take the field, after the secular forces are disbanded, and at peace. Perhaps, however, the Gambier Observer deems it unquestionably a part of the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Ohio. If so, the reverend editor must revoke his judgment, and agree that the Wisconsin clergy are right.

The only case apparently at variance with those I have adduced, is that of the District of Columbia; where the Bishop of Maryland retains jurisdiction over the portion formerly belonging to that State, and the Bishop of Virginia over what once belonged to it. But this variance is only in appearance. The case is an anomalous one. The District of Columbia has no sovereignty of its own, like a state, or partial sovereignty, like a territory, but is under that of the whole United States. It has no legislature of its own, and no representation in Congress, not even of the subordinate kind which the territories have. It neither has civil independence, nor is in progress thereto. Its laws are mixed, some being those of Maryland, some those of Virginia, and some made for it, not by its own citizens, but by Congress. In short, it is neither a state nor a territory, but of a character intermediate between those and the tracts occupied by the United States for military or naval purposes; and, like the latter, should the United States cease to have occasion for that District, its two portions would doubtless revert to the states which ceded them. So far, the separation even of the District from the two states is incomplete. This case, therefore, has no bearing on that of Wisconsin, or on the principle I am defending.

I have said that this principle, that diocesan boundaries conform, of course, to those of the states, has operated *tacitly* in the cases mentioned. On reflection, I am disposed to think that the fact, that these several examples, though occurring at different periods, harmonize so uniformly, indicates something more than a silent acquiescence in an unwritten rule. I think it may justly be held, that our acts and records of organization and legislation have been tacitly allowed such a *construction* as will base the rule upon *it*. The quotation made from the preface to the Prayer-book is very strongly to this effect. The fundamental articles, proposed in 1784, and approved of in 1785, speak of "the Episcopal Church in each state," and of "every state where there shall be a bishop duly consecrated and settled," and also of "associated congregations in two or more states:" not a hint is there of any other boundaries than those of the states. The same language pervades the first proposed constitution; also the second, in which the article concerning the election of bishops was so changed as to read, "by the Convention of that State," instead of "by the respective Conventions;" the effect of which alteration was, that two or more states could not unite in choosing the same person for their bishop, but must choose him separately, if they so desired, and every diocese with a bishop must consist of one state, and no more; indeed, the permission of two or more states to associate at all as a church appears in none of the constitutions. The phraseology, "State Convention," "Convention of a State," and the use of the word state for diocese, constantly occur in our early records, and frequently in those later. Our constitutions all along have conformed, as does the present one, to this mode of expression; and the proposition to alter it, now before the Church, is made only with reference to the division of the larger dioceses. In 1795, a canon was passed which forbids "a congregation in any diocese or state to unite with a church in any other diocese or state;" a regulation which proves the intention of our Church to conform to the boundaries of the states those of her several jurisdictions. The spirit of this canon justified the immediate secession of the Church in Maine from that in Massachusetts; and although the word "state" was erased in 1832, and only the equivalent word "diocese" retained, its spirit declares that Wisconsin ceased to be part of the Diocese of Michigan, when the civil separation took place. This is something for this branch of my argument. But I rest it chiefly on the fact, that our records show that a state, an entire state, and no more than a state, has always defined the extent of our diocesan jurisdiction, or ecclesiastical subdivisions. The Constitution has never recognised any, but "the Church in each state," and the tacit (nay, almost necessary) *construction* has been, that, in any region severed from a state, the Church there, or afterward planted there, was severed from "the Church in [that] state." The churches in Maine ceased early in 1820 to be part of the Church in Massachusetts; nor could the latter admit into its Convention clergy or deputies from the former; neither could it send them to the General Convention. And when Michigan became a state, the churches in Wisconsin ceased to be part of "the Church in [that] State;" the clergy there could no longer sit in the Michigan Convention, though it appears from the last Journal that by a mistake their names were called; neither can they be chosen to represent Michigan in the General Convention.

The clergy, indeed, in Maine continued in that sort of connexion with Bishop Griswold, which arises from what is called canonical residence; they were amenable to him for purposes of discipline; and if they had required letters of dismission before their new diocese was formed and recognised, they must have obtained them from him. Hence, in the vote of their Convention, he was only requested to "exercise episcopal jurisdiction over the *churches*;" over the clergy individually he retained jurisdiction, and by having that over the churches conferred on him, he regained full diocesan power over the clergy in all their ecclesiastical relations. And so the Wisconsin clergy remain under the ecclesiastical authorities to which they respectively belonged before they became separate from Michigan; one of them under the Bishop of that Diocese, and four under the Bishop of New York. (See Swords' Almanac.) They will so remain, unless they get letters of dismission to other places, till a diocese of their own is formed, or till they are assigned, by the General Convention, to the jurisdiction of a missionary bishop. In the mean time, their churches may ask the temporary services of any of our bishops, as Detroit did formerly those of Bishop Hobart, and as New Orleans has those of Bishop Brownell and Bishop Otey.

I have ventured to suggest that the Church ought to act on the principle now advocated, as far as can be done with safety; and I see no cause for apprehension in regard to it. A civil division of any of the states is very improbable. And nothing else can raise a question of the sort, except disputes concerning the state boundaries, which may yet remain unsettled, and the adjustment or change of boundaries when territories are to be promoted to the rank of states; and for these the rule mentioned has proved sufficient, and appears, indeed, to be the only one that can be devised. I see, therefore, no occasion to legislate in the matter. Should that, however, be done, it will be *ex post facto* as regards Wisconsin. That region is now ecclesiastically independent of Michigan, as completely as Kentucky is of Virginia, Vermont of New York, or Maine of Massachusetts. The General Convention can do no more than declare the fact; but as this was not done in the former cases, it is unnecessary in the present one.

P. S. By the proposed alteration of the Constitution, the word "state" will be changed to "diocese" throughout that document, and "parts of dioceses" already existing, or hereafter to be formed, may be joined together, and erected into a new diocese. This change, if carried, will more than neutralize our past rule of conforming dioceses to the state boundaries. these may then be wholly disregarded. It is a point worthy of deep consideration, whether our Church is prepared to go so far, and abandon a rule so convenient, and that has worked so well—and be left without any fixed rule—merely to concede to the chances and fluctuations of "parts of dioceses," and thus be liable to be disturbed by the local policies of small portions of her communion, which will then lose the principal check that now restrains them. If it is deemed best not to subject the Church to these risks, but allow her still to retain as much regard to state boundaries as is consistent with the plan of dividing the larger dioceses—no such new diocese to pass those boundaries, or be formed of portions of different states—this can be effected by erasing from the second paragraph of the proposed new article the words "or parts of dioceses." This erasure will not effect the rest of the matter of that article.

* Doubtless a mistake: about that time a separation was proposed, but not carried.

From the Colonial Churchman.

THE CHURCH OF NORWAY.

IT is a peculiar characteristic of the Norwegian Church, that there is no dissent from it; no sectarians. A few years ago, a person of the name of Houghan had a few followers; but his doctrine on religious points did not differ from that of the established Church. It was his object to inspire a more religious spirit, and more strict observance of the Church doctrine; so that his followers were similar to what is called the evangelical part of the community of the Church of England. But even this slight attempt at a division, within the pale of the Church itself, appears to have had no success. There are several reasons for this peculiarity of the Norwegian Church. The principal, perhaps, is, that it has no temporal power; no political existence as a part of the state; no courts, or laws, or interests of its own, jarring with those of the other classes of the community, and raising animosity between them and the clergy. The clergy are, in political rights or privileges, on the same footing as any other class of the community. The Lutheran religion is part of the state; but not the ministers who are employed to teach it. They are represented in the Storthing like other citizens; and having no separate interests as a body of clergy, enjoy individually the confidence of the people, and a unity of interests with them. They are often sent to the Storthing as their representatives. This unity of worldly interests prevents dissent in spiritual matters.

Another cause of the great influence of the clergy, and of the total absence of religious dissent, is the great consideration in which the rite of confirmation is held. It is not here, as it practically is in the Church of England, a mere ceremony in which the bishop knows nothing personally of the parties he is admitting into the Church, and the parish priest knows little more than that they were baptized, and are of due age. There is here a strict examination by the bishop or the probst, or rural dean, into the young person's knowledge of his moral and religious duties, his capacity, acquirements, and character; and it is only after a long previous preparation by his parish minister, equal almost to a course of education, the confirmants being instructed singly as well as in classes, that the individual is presented for this examination. I was present lately at a confirmation of about twenty young persons in our parish church by the probst. The examination, in presence of the congregation, occupied nearly two hours. It was not merely asking and replying, by a string of set questions and answers from the Church Catechism. It resembled more the kind of examination used in teaching the reading classes in the sessional school in Edinburg. It was a sifting trial to know if each individual attached the real meaning to the words he was using, and actually did understand what he had been taught on the subject of religion. It was evident that considerable pains had been taken with the instruction of each individual. To pass such a confirmation implies that the young person is well grounded in the principles of his moral and religious duties, and is of good character and understanding. It is, in common life, equivalent to taking a degree in the learned professions, being in fact a certificate of capacity for ordinary duties and trusts. It is, accordingly, so considered in Norway. "A con-

firmed shop-boy wants a place;" "wanted, a *confirmed* girl, who can cook," are the ordinary advertisements to or from that class of the community; and the not being confirmed would be held equivalent to not having a character, either from want of conduct, or of ordinary capacity. Something similar prevailed formerly in Scotland, but not to the same extent. A young man, of the laboring class, usually took a certificate of his good character from the minister when he removed to a distant parish. The confirmation in Norway certifies much more, as in the face of the congregation, the confirmant has shown that he can read, and has the use of his mental faculties to an ordinary degree, according to his station, and has moral and religious principles to direct him. It is extraordinary that the Church of England has not, like this Lutheran sister in the north, kept fast hold of a rite which connected her so closely with society, its education and its business. This simple discharge of an unexceptionable duty shuts out dissent from the Norwegian Church.

From the Episcopal Recorder.

CHURCH COMMUNION.

It was evidently the will of our Lord Jesus Christ that his religion should embrace whole families and whole nations. It is clear to all persons, diligently reading the early writers, that the servants and children of believing parents were baptized with them; that these children and servants were forthwith, if the bishop were present, received to confirmation; that every Lord's day they partook of the Lord's supper; that they were divided amongst the deacons and deaconesses into classes; that their places were assigned to them in the house of God; that each person absent was noticed, the Lord's supper administered to him in private if sick, and the occasion of his absence sought out, if he were not sick; that all who could, met for prayer and praise, morning and evening every day; that the lives and conversations of all were so strictly watched, that every offence was brought forward for inquiry and punishment every Monday; and that thus, not only parents and masters were answerable for the most thorough, minute, and constant religious education and restraint of their families, but the living ministry also in their various orders were daily and weekly brought into contact with every family and every delinquent individual. Under such a system, animated by the deepest spirit of piety, would not all be likely to be fitted for the Lord's supper every Lord's day? From such a system, pervaded by the best influences of heartfelt piety, such as men required and had when liable every day to be called upon to *burn* for their faith; and followed up by a discipline so strict, that the slightest moral delinquency was sure to be detected and punished by spiritual penalties, and those alone; could any thing but good come? This is the system which the writer thinks ought never to have been abandoned, and to which our beloved Church is urged by every consideration, above all others, to return.

But, in the course of time, and through the depravity of man, this system became sadly corrupted. Without any (comparatively speaking) of the holy instruction, examples, supervision, and discipline of early times, all persons were admitted to the Lord's supper, and still, notwithstanding their unholy lives, allowed to come. Thus it was at the dawning of the Reformation. And what was the cure for so great and intolerable an evil then proposed? Why, by the wisest and holiest of men,—not the adoption of a new system, but a restoration of the old; not strict rules of admission, but strict rules of discipline. And so for nearly a hundred years every where, and so ever since, almost every where, the national character of Christianity was not lost sight of, and new inventions were repudiated, and a return to primitive discipline and practice aimed at, until the Puritans of various names arose, and with them commenced the disastrous system which mainly has been acted out here in America for more than one hundred years, until its tendencies have developed themselves in the most astounding results. Oh! it is heart-rending to look upon the millions of baptized children amongst us, who have no more idea of the solemnity of their vows than the Heathen; and millions, more wretched still, who have never been baptized. These are the evils—neglect of family piety, of the religious education of children, of general reverence for religion—growing out of the departure from great Church principles, over which the heart of the writer groans.—*Bishop Smith.*

ONE SOURCE OF CONTENTIONS.

In a sermon on the words, "If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men," Dr. South says, "There are some persons, that, like so many salamanders, cannot live but in the fire—cannot enjoy themselves but in the heats and sharpness of contention; the very breath they draw does not so much enliven, as kindle and enflame them; they have so much bitterness in their nature, that they must now and then be discharging it upon somebody; they must have vent, and sometimes breathe themselves in an invective or a quarrel, or perhaps their health requires it." "Now such tempers there are in the world, and always were, and always will be; and so long as there be such, how can there be a constant, undisturbed quietness in societies? We may as well expect that nobody should die, when the air is generally infected, or that poison should be still in the stomach, and yet work no effect upon the body. God must first weed the world of all contentious spirits and ill dispositions before a universal peace can grow in it."

Connecticut Observer.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

METHODIST EPISCOPACY.

NO. V.

In this number I shall commence the argument in proof that there was an order of ministers in the primitive Church superior to presbyters or elders, to whom belonged the right of ordaining other ministers. I will commence with direct scriptural evidence, and if I am not mistaken, the sacred volume furnishes more and clearer proof on the subject of church government than has generally been supposed by the opponents of episcopacy.

The first epistle of Paul to Timothy contains evidence that he possessed authority in the Church above a presbyter. The apostle gives him clear and definite instructions respecting the qualifications of bishops or elders, and deacons, and other matters pertaining to the government of the Church, which most clearly imply that Timothy had the entire charge of the whole Church, elders, deacons, and people, with authority which could not have been possessed by but one person in the same place at the same time, though it is evident that there were many elders within the limits of his jurisdiction. 1 Tim. iii. 2, 8, 10, "A bishop then must be blameless, vigilant, sober, of good report, given to hospitality, apt to teach. Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre. And let these also first be proved, then let them use the office of a deacon." With me these instructions clearly imply that Timothy possessed the exclusive right of selecting and consecrating both presbyters and deacons, and of governing them. This follows from the reason which the apostle himself renders for giving such instructions, verses 14 and 15, "These things write I unto thee that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God." That Timothy may know how to behave himself in the house of God, St. Paul writes to him, informing him what are the qualifications of presbyters and deacons, how they should behave themselves, and how he should demean himself toward them. Now, as the qualifications and conduct of elders and deacons concerned the behavior of Timothy, it follows that he must have been the proper judge of their qualifications and conduct, and must have had the right of selecting, consecrating, and governing them. But of this position we shall find additional proof in chap. v. 1, 2, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, "Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father, and the younger men as brethren, the elder women as mothers, the younger as sisters. Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor. Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses: them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear. I charge thee before God, that thou observe these without preferring one above another, doing nothing by partiality. Lay hands suddenly on no man." These directions so plainly imply the episcopal character and authority of Timothy, as to need but little comment. "Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father: them that sin rebuke before all, that others may fear," are expressions which suppose authority in Timothy to censure. "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor," supposes authority to dispense rewards. "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses," supposes authority to receive complaints against elders, and to try them. "Lay hands suddenly on no man," supposes the right of consecrating to the work of the ministry, or of refraining from it, as he might judge of the suitableness or unsuitableness of the condidate for holy orders. The apostle here gives directions how to deal with offending ministers, how to deal with faithful ministers, and by what rules to be governed in the choice and consecration of ministers; and that this was all the proper work of Timothy appears from the solemn charge which he gives him respecting this very work, "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these, without preferring one above another, doing nothing by partiality."

The apostle, in his second letter to Timothy, chap. ii. 2, says, "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." This most clearly proves that Timothy was authorized to commit the ministry to such, and such only as he judged faithful, who should teach others, that an authorized ministry might be preserved in the Church. And how was Timothy to commit these things to others? I answer, by ordaining them, or by consecrating them for the work of the ministry. This is the sense in which Dr. A. Clarke understands this text; and though he denies that the succession has been preserved, he nevertheless bears a decided testimony to the episcopal character of Timothy, and that it was by succession that ministers derived their authority in the days of the apostles. In commenting on the above text, he says, the apostle "seems to refer here to the doctrines delivered to him, when, in the presence of many witnesses, he laid his hands upon him, see 1 Tim. vi. 12. Then the apostle gave him the proper form of sound words, which he was to teach others; and now he tells him to commit these truths to faithful men in the same way that they were committed to him; that the truth might be preserved in the Church, and holy men appointed successively to preach it." See *Clarke's Commentary* on Tim. ii. 2. I think it has now been shown beyond dispute that Timothy did hold episcopal jurisdiction over the whole church of Ephesus, embracing presbyters, deacons, and laity. Now, as this authority belonged to Timothy in particular, it could not have belonged to the presbyters in general. How could St Paul make Timothy responsible for the preservation of the truth and the purity of the Church, to be secured by the selection and consecration of faithful men who should be able to teach others, and by the exercise of a healthful discipline, charging him before God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and elect angels, if he had no more voice in the government of the Church than presbyters in general, there being a number of them in the Church at this time? Let those answer this question who can. In my next, I shall consider the episcopal character of Titus.

Diakonos.

For the Churchman.

REV. MR. COLTON'S LECTURES.

Mr. Editor,—It is probably known to most of your readers that the Rev. C. Colton is delivering a course of lectures to the young men of this city on Sunday evenings at the Lyceum in Broadway. On Sunday evening last, a crowded audience attested by their silence and deep attention the interest they took both in the *matter* and *manner* of the distinguished lecturer. Indeed, for originality of thought, justness of views, and attic elegance and purity of style, I have seldom heard a discourse of superior merit; while to these were united, what is of still higher value, a truly Christian spirit and evangelical sentiments. After a happy exordium, Mr. Colton, in elucidating the doctrine of his text, "Young men exhort to be sober-minded," observed in substance, that sobriety has respect to opinion, to sentiment, to appetite, and to manners. The opposite of sobriety, in regard to opinion, is extravagance; in regard to sentiment, enthusiasm; in regard to appetite, intemperance; in regard to manners, excess.

* * * * * *

After presenting many forcible illustrations, Mr. C remarked, that "extravagant opinions are characteristic of the age; and the worst of it is, that they enter so deeply into theories of character and society, that they prevail so extensively, that they are propagated with so much zeal and determination, and that they threaten to undermine the foundations of truth, virtue, and Christianity," &c.

Mr. Colton concluded an eloquent passage on the disastrous consequences of extravagant opinions in the following terms: "Prescriptive opinion, however well proved and recommended by successful experiment, has no claims to respect, but is the more offensive on that account. No institutions of society, no rights of individuals, if opposed to them, are sacred. Laws interwoven with the entire fabric of society, religion as revered by multitudes, the sanctuaries of God, of domestic retreat, and of private character, are alike invaded by their ruthless hands; and we are threatened with a change of times and customs, over which society pauses with mingled emotions of horror and dismay. What department of politics, of religion, of morals, of manners, or of social life among us, has not, within a brief period, experienced some daring crusade of this sort?"

* * * * * *

Sobriety is the crown of the moral affections properly adjusted; it is the queen of order in the soul; it demands a symmetrical arrangement of all the faculties, intellectual and moral, so that each shall have its own place, and wield its appropriate influence. It is the most indispensable element of a perfect state of society on earth, or in heaven. In proportion as it is wanting, confusion reigns; and peradventure violence will not lag behind. Where sobriety has lost all influence, anarchy and desolation succeed.

Sobriety is a reasonable state of the mind and affections; it supposes that all the furniture of the soul is in its place, each part in relation to each, and the whole in relation to the world and to the universe around; that all things and all beings are estimated according to their merits. It is not, therefore, inconsistent with the most fervid and active state of the affections. If God is loved in heaven, or on earth, as he is worthy to be loved; if a pure heart estimates all other pure hearts according to their claims; if the parent loves his child, and every one his kindred and friends, as he ought; if the pitiful yearn over the suffering, as is natural; why, then, surely there must be a fervid and active state of the affections. This is reasonable. The ends of society and of a moral government would not otherwise be answered. Not to "weep with those who weep, and rejoice with those who rejoice," would not only be violating a divine command, but suppressing the spontaneous, and therefore sober, effusions of a kind and benevolent heart. Not to fall down and worship before the throne of heaven—not to join in its anthems of praise not to respond to its chorus of hallelujahs—would be treason and apostacy. Sobriety in any place, and in any society, if it be holy, is a conformity to the spirit of that place, and to the state of that society.

Truth and reason are always sober; and so are virtue and religion. They thoroughly eschew all extravagances of opinion, of sentiment, and of conduct; the appetites they hold in restraint, and under discipline. Virtue is indeed a moral affection, and hath in it the quality of fervor. And so is religion; and the fervors thereof sometimes border on exstacy—may be exstacy itself; but it is holy; it is calm; it is imperturbed; it hath in it the quality of pureness—a pureness bright as the rays of the sun, and mild as the moonbeams.

Mr. Colton directed attention to God as a pattern of sobriety in his works and doings; and among other things remarked, that the supply of the wants of creation from the stores of God's inexhaustible hand, infinitely numerous and great as they are, and constantly urgent—nay, the relief of the most sudden and distressing exigencies of human calamity, as administered by God's providence, is all a sober work.

Calvary itself, and the cross, and He who died upon it, now stand up before us, a quiet, though heart-appealing scene. It demands our tears; it excites our hope; it calls us to a course of new obedience; but it does not drive us to distraction—to madness. It does not excite, but appeases the violent emotions of the soul. For it is *an atonement*, a satisfaction to God, and a satisfaction to conscience. It gives peace. "Now, therefore, there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus."

May this peace be yours, my friends, &c.

I believe that there has been but one feeling among the hundreds from different parts of the city who have attended Mr. Colton's first two lectures to young men, and that it is a feeling of deep interest and decided approbation. Expectation is evidently raised, and I believe well-founded.

New York, March 6. An Observer.

For the Churchman.

He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption. *Gal.* vi. 8.

Should any one doubt this let him make the experiment. He may practise any gratification of his lower nature beyond the absolute necessities of the animal economy, and if a moderate period do not enable him to comprehend, and lead him fully to believe this declaration, he must be, not only beyond the reach of theology, but even of impressions derived from bodily sense itself.

Every one is aware how literally true is this text, when applied to any form of gross sensual indulgence, whether the degree of it be greater or less. The flesh is heir to corruption, through the whole catalogue of disease and death: to make its pleasures our care, is of necessity to claim part in its inheritance. This might have been supposed without the instructions of experience: with their aid it ought never to be forgotten.

But how are persons of reputable morals concerned in a doctrine like this? The reply is at hand: we must take the expressions of the apostle in their widest sense; and shall then find them to include much that the common eye of man is accustomed to behold with favorable regard. "He that soweth to the flesh" is any one that obeys the demands of his earthly nature as depraved by sinful affections. It is not merely the glutton, or drunkard, or adulterer, but also the covetous, the ambitious, the proud, or even the slothful, who is intended; in fine, it is every one who does not live after the Spirit, even the Holy Spirit, as resident in the bosom of a godly man.

The term "corruption," also, is to be taken not only in its literal sense, but as including all the forms and measures of evil engendered by sin; so that a Bonaparte, no less than a common drunkard, may share in this harvest of ill both here and hereafter.

This text, as is now apparent, is only a particular form of the general sentence, "The wages of sin is death;" but with the advantage that it fixes the attention upon many striking illustrations of that terrible truth. We are familiar with the common instances where the indulgence of fleshly lusts brings upon men the most serious evil, and from these cases derive the strongest assurance that all sin will, in like manner, receive its threatened punishment.

There is one class of actions to which particular attention seems here due. I refer to those instances where important changes are made in life, solely or chiefly with a view to our own convenience. The Apostle Paul, when he had come to the knowledge of the Saviour, saw at once that his course must from that time be new, and accordingly he tells us, "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood;" and here presents us with a true pattern for every analogous case. True, indeed, he may refer to the fact that he did not consult his brethren according to the flesh, fearing lest they might dissuade him from his noble purposes; but the spirit of his conduct should always be our own. We are not primarily to ask of friends, who may think more of ease than of duty, nor of our own flesh and blood, "wherein dwelleth no good thing," what course we are to pursue; but assuming that God will make our present good his own care, we must ask, *What is duty?* and proceed without regard to personal consequences. It is, doubtless, an opposite course of conduct that brings upon us a large share of the trials that we encounter. The children of this world may seek, and often, without hindrance, attain large measures of present good; but they who are to be fitted for heaven can never be allowed to prosper in a course where self is put before the glory of God, and the interests of a Saviour's kingdom.

Such, at least, is the writer's experience. If he were ever to court disappointment, he is sure of the means to encounter it. Only put self, especially present self, in the foreground of the calculation, and that same beloved idol will be the first to suffer, and the last to see any good. How can it be otherwise, when Christ himself has distinctly informed us, "He that will save his life shall lose it," i. e., he that values his own convenience more than the interests of my kingdom, shall lose the object of his most cherished desires: in other words, he that will make present happiness the direct object of his life, shall encounter only evil in his way; or if for a time it may appear otherwise, the result will be the utter loss of all that he could value.

If we duly bear these truths in mind, we may be spared the trouble of some changes in life that we else shall make; and, what for ourselves is likely to be still more important, we shall escape some of the chief miseries to which a far reaching eye may see us exposed. Much, very much, may unquestionably be gained by remembering from this moment onward, "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." C. S. A.

Newark, Feb. 8, 1837.

For the Churchman.

The following extract from a small work of a Leicester clergyman, (Robinson,) of some quarter of a century, was eulogized at the time of its publication; and if, Mr. Editor, you deem the praise not entirely undeserved, you will probably allow it a corner of your very useful paper.

"The liturgy is commended to your approbation and esteem, as being founded on evangelical principles. The essential doctrines of the Gospel, established in the articles, are here most beautifully exhibited in a devotional application of them, and you are required to pray as those that believe them. Do three divine and co-equal Persons exist in the unity of the Godhead? The eternal majesty of each of these you acknowledge and you adore, while you continually ascribe, 'Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.' Is man a fallen, guilty, depraved, and helpless creature? You are taught to humble yourselves before God with deepest contrition and self-abhorrence, and to deprecate his wrath, as those who deserve to perish. 'O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders!' Is there no other foundation laid for a sinner's hope and confidence toward God than Jesus Christ? The perpetual recurrence of his name throughout the liturgy instructs you to offer up every petition through faith in him, and to make mention of his righteousness only. Are the influences of the Spirit necessary to form us to all right tempers and habits? On this ground you supplicate the Lord, 'from whom all good things do come,' that 'by his holy inspiration you may think those things that be good, and by his merciful guiding may perform the same. This, then, is a service which is adapted to the sentiments and desires of those who truly receive the Gospel; and these grand peculiarities, which give offence to some, constitute its very essence, and are its highest excellence. Its petitions also are so spiritual, and conveyed in language so purely devotional, that, though it encourages not the wild raptures of enthusiasts, it is calculated to kindle and keep alive the best and warmest affections of our hearts toward God, love, and peace, and joy. If, in our attendance upon it we are trifling and dissipated, cold and formal, the fault is altogether in ourselves, and no blame whatever can on this account attach to the liturgy. Are not similar effects found where precomposed prayers are not made use of? And is not the service of the Church, if seriously regarded, well suited to prevent them? The frequent changes from prayer to praise, the intermixture of instruction in the reading of the holy Scriptures, the various responses provided for the people, by which they are called upon to bear a part in the solemn worship, and the repeated admonitions addressed to them by their minister, 'Let us pray,' have a manifest tendency to fix and enliven the mind, or to recall the wandering thoughts, and raise the heart to God."

Selected for the Churchman.

EXTRACTS.

Where no sabbath is observed, there disease, poverty, and profligacy generally prevail: had we no sabbath, we should soon have no religion.

A. Clarke.

What is grand and substantial pleases long, while that which is only neat and handsome charms for a while, but soon cloys. Quintilian.

If the principles of Christianity are true, as we all absolutely profess to believe they are, then, to be sure, the greatest and most important matters of this world are vain, and even less than vanity itself; all our knowledge is but ignorance, our riches poverty, our pleasures bitterness, and our honors vile and dishonorable. How little do those men know, who are ambitious of glory, what it really is, and how to be attained! Nay, they eagerly catch at the empty shadow of it, while they avoid and turn their backs upon that glory which is real, substantial, and everlasting. The happiness of good men, in the life to come, is not only infinitely above all our expressions, but even beyond our most enlarged thoughts.

Leighton.

That man shall never persuade me that he believes the truth and certainty of heavenly joys, who cleaves to this earth, nay, who does not scorn and despise it, with all its baits and allurements, and employ all his powers, as well as his utmost industry, to obtain this immense and external blessing. Ibid.

The life that is devoted to knowledge passes silently away, and is very little diversified by events. To talk in public, to think in solitude, to read and to hear, to inquire and answer inquiries, is the business of a scholar. He wanders about the world without pomp or terror, and is neither known nor valued, but by men like himself. Johnson.

No man was ever great by imitation. Knowledge will always predominate over ignorance, as man governs the other animals.

Knowledge is certainly one of the means of pleasure, as is confessed by the natural desire which every mind feels of increasing its ideas. Ignorance is mere privation, by which nothing can be produced; it is a vacuity in which the soul sits motionless and torpid, for want of attraction, and without knowing why, we always rejoice when we learn, and grieve when we forget. Ibid.

It ought to humble most persons to reflect, that for a large portion of the respect in which they are held, they are indebted to ignorance; to the necessary unacquaintance with each other's hearts. Hall.

Education: that which qualifies men to be good citizens; and renders them fit to govern or obey.

Plato.

Antinomianism is a monster which can live only in darkness; bring light upon it, and it expires.

The worldly man is ever discontented with his situation and circumstances, and, therefore, always desirous of change; the Christian is at peace with all around him, and only discontented with his sins, from which he is always desirous to flee. The former is ever wandering in search of a happiness which he never can find; the other is always happy wherever God's presence is felt.

More harm is done to the cause of religion by the misconduct of professors, than by all the endeavors of the ungodly.

It is strange to hear so much noise of religion in the world, and to find so little piety.

The countryman who has never seen any place larger than his own country town, thinks highly of it; its petty buildings are in his eyes magnificent, its narrow and dirty streets, wide and commodious, the old-fashioned family coach and the faded liveries of the squire, all of human grandeur that heart could desire. But bring him to the metropolis, show him its palaces and temples, its squares and thoroughfares, its gorgeous pageantries, and luxurious vehicles, and his own town sinks into utter contempt in his eyes. So is it with the worldly man. The employments and occupations of life are to him of the highest importance; his years are spent in the pursuit of gain, his health and peace ruined by ambitious schemes; but let his soul be once enlightened by the Spirit of God, and these pursuits immediately sink into their appropriate insignificance, when compared with the great and striking beauty of the new ends and intentions of life which are unfolded to him.

Watson.

For the Churchman.

CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION.

Mr. Editor,—It would have done your heart good if you had witnessed the scene which was presented in Calvary Church, last Sunday afternoon. It appears that the Rector of this church has adopted the truly primitive plan, and one which is enjoined by the Church, of giving the children of the congregation, or so many as may be sent to him, regular catechetical instruction: selecting for this purpose the afternoon of the first Sunday in each month, and devoting the time usually occupied by the sermon.

Last Sunday afternoon was the second time the children were thus instructed; and, as I said above, Sir, it would have made your heart leap with joy, to have seen nearly sixty children—boys and girls—assembled around the chancel of this neat, though humble temple; from the youngest to the oldest answering every question which was asked by their minister with the greatest promptitude and correctness. Yes, Sir, and your pleasure would have received no little addition from the sight of a congregation that *filled* the church, testifying by their countenances and attention the delight they experienced in hearing (many of them for the *first time*) the solemn and comprehensive answers of the Church Catechism.

On this spot, where, six months ago, scarce a sound was heard, save the impious jest, or the loud laugh, as the crowded railroad cars bore along those who, in defiance of the express command of God, sought to profane his holy day, *now* may be heard the soul-stirring chants of the Church, borne upon the swelling notes of the organ, and joined by the voices of a grateful congregation. Or, perchance, one may hear the feeble notes of the little band assembled in the Sunday school, praising God for the return of his holy day, and for the gift of a Church that has made ample provision for little children.

Before Calvary Church reared its head, opening wide its doors to *all*, and offering, *without money* and *without price*, the Gospel of Christ, and the services of the Church; many of these very children (imitating the example of their parents) were spending the hours of this sacred day in idleness and sin. With this fact in my mind, I could not, Sir, restrain the expression of my feelings, when, on last Sunday, I saw before me such a band of children engaged in such exercises. I do not remember to have seen any of them who could read without a Prayer-book in their hands; all of them manifesting marked attention to the decent forms of the Church: even those who hardly knew their letters, I found knew and could repeat the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. With the congregation, I listened, with pleasure and profit, to the responses of the children, and the explanations of the Rector, as he endeavored—*successfully*, I should judge from the countenances of the children—to show the goodness of God in making them, by baptism, "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." As a Christian, as a Churchman, I felt joy at the sight, and am well persuaded that the result has shown the correctness of the judgment of those who believed that this destitute portion of our city would welcome gladly the Gospel of salvation—as proclaimed by an authorized minister, and set forth in the pure and primitive services of the Episcopal Church. Spectator.

For the Churchman.

DANGER OF APPLYING MERE HUMAN LEARNING TO THEOLOGY.

The following sensible remarks were induced by a criticism on Rev. Dr. Daubeny's "Eight Discourses on the Connexion between the Old and New Testament, considered as two parts of *the same* Divine Revelation." I extract this from "Orthodox Usages," which some quarter of a century since enjoyed its full meed of celebrity in England. The American bishops and other writers on divinity seem to me singularly free from the display of that knowledge which *puffeth up*, as is a stumbling-block, and not a guide, but still it may be well to lift the warning voice on this subject also. Yours, Sigma.

"After some general observations upon the diversity of opinion which prevails on religion, and some pertinent remarks on that loose system of morality which has, for some time past, been gaining ground among a class of mankind from whom a better line of conduct might have been expected; after noticing the zealous exertions of 'those, falsely called Philosophers,' such as Hume, who confessed that he had never read the New Testament with attention; and we may add such as Voltaire, Godwin, and Paine, who perverted what they had read, for the purpose 'of introducing baseless theories, which are the misshaped creatures of their own ungoverned fancy,' the author rightly concludes, 'Hence have we to lament that disregard for received opinions, and that contempt for established institutions, which have by degrees generated that loose system of morality, and that general indifference for religion, which it will require the wisdom and exertion, both of the statesman and divine, effectually to counteract.'

"To counteract this evil, Dr. D. then proceeds to trace it up to its source: 'Heathenism was originally built on the corruption of Revelation. And by the neglect of that divine source of illumination many Christians have fallen, and are continually falling back into a similar state of spiritual darkness. In both cases, the vain imagination of foolish man has superseded the infallible standard of religious truth: and the effect, in both cases, has not failed to correspond with the cause.'

"He then lays down as a primary truth, that 'on spiritual subjects nothing can be discovered by the light of unassisted reason. Consequently,' that 'to every wise man opinions, however plausible and ingenious, will afford but a poor compensation for any deviation from the standard of divine truth.' This, however, does not make, in the least, against the utility of rational criticism. But rational criticism must proceed 'on this acknowledged principle: that what has been revealed must be true; and, consequently, that no defect of comprehension on our parts can justify an argument against the clear letter of Scripture.' Hence the science of divinity is greatly indebted to 'that talent for close reasoning and critical investigation, which distinguishes the writings of some modern divines; and renders them hardly less serviceable to the cause of Christianity than the pious, learned, and unwearied labors of its more early professors.'

The learned author then remarks upon 'the excellences for which the writings of the primitive fathers of the Church are particularly distinguished. 'They were plain, simple, and convincing.' As human learning was introduced into the science of theology, it was accompanied by 'Philosophical Researches, metaphysical subtleties, and vain reasonings.'

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1837.

TERMS,

Two dollars and fifty cents, if paid in advance, or three dollars if at the end of the year.

General Theological Seminary.—The Right Rev. Bishop Brownell, as appears by a letter to the Bishop of this Diocese, after full consideration of the subject, finds himself unable, consistently with other necessary claims upon his time, and a seasonable return to his diocese, to accept the agency for raising contributions in the Western and South-western States toward the endowment of the Professorship of Pastoral Theology and Pulpit Eloquence. He expresses the opinion, however, that at some suitable period, in the course of the year, the larger cities in the South-west will show themselves liberal in this important aid to one of the great institutions of the Church. The Alumni of the Seminary, therefore, in those States, have been associated with their brethren in appointment as agents, and each been addressed on the subject.

They are as follows:—

In Ohio. The Rev. Edward W. Peet, the Rev. Ephraim Punderson, the Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, the Rev. Seth Davis.

In Mississippi. The Rev. Roderic H. Ranney, the Rev. Richard Cox, the Rev. John F. Fish.

In Alabama. The Rev. John M. Robinson, the Rev. Caleb S. Ives.

In Michigan. The Rev. Henry F. M. Whitesides.

In Illinois. The Rev. Joseph L. Darrow.

In Indiana. The Rev. Samuel R. Johnson, the Rev. Lloyd Windsor.

In Missouri. The Rev. Frederick F. Peake.

In Louisiana. The Rev. Nathan W. Munroe.

Diocesan Boundaries.—On our first page will be found an able article, from the Protestant Episcopalian, in regard to the churches in Wisconsin. The point in dispute, as briefly stated by the writer, is this: "Part of the new Territory of Wisconsin belonged to the Territory of Michigan when the latter was formed into a diocese; it has recently been made civilly independent of the State of Michigan. Does this fact involve its ecclesiastical independence? Does that part of Wisconsin belong to the Diocese of Bishop M'Coskry?" Bishop M'Coskry, and others also, as it would seem, have taken the affirmative, the writer in the Protestant Episcopalian the negative. The argument of the latter appears to us to be highly satisfactory, and we suppose will be generally regarded as conclusive. The Editor of the Southern Churchman, in introducing it to his readers, says: "The opinion we have heretofore hastily expressed was formed on what we perceive not to have been a statement of the whole ground of controversy."

The subject has been so fully treated by Παρεπιδημος that we can think of nothing to add to it, on the ground of principle or precedent growing out of our own constitution and history. But it has occurred to us, to inquire what is the foundation of the rule which, as is shown by the writer in the Episcopalian, has been adopted in our Church? What is the reason that our ecclesiastical boundaries have been made to conform to those of the States? Was the rule one of accident, or mere convenience, or has it, like our

other usages, been adopted in compliance with primitive prescription? In our judgment, the rule is as ancient as the time of the apostles; and if so, this consideration may serve to fortify the argument which we have this week transferred to our columns.

It is plain, says Dawson, (Origin of Laws, book v. c. 9,) whom we shall quote, in substance, for the remainder of the article, from the writings of the New Testament, that the blessed apostles, according as our LORD had commanded them, travelled over all the provinces of the empire, and wherever they made any converts, there they founded a church, which was afterward denominated, either from the province, or the chief city, or metropolis of it. A church was first founded at Jerusalem, the chief city of Palestine, and called the Church at Jerusalem; another at Antioch, the chief city of Syria, and so called the Church at Antioch; another at Corinth, the chief city of Achaia, called the Church at Corinth. We read, also, that St. Paul "went through *Syria* and *Cilicia* confirming the churches:" and also over Galatia and Phrygia, in order, confirming all the disciples. We read, likewise, in the epistles of St. Paul, of the churches of Galatia, the churches of Asia, the churches of Macedonia, and the churches of Judea. Now Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Phrygia, Asia, Judea, and Macedonia, were all Roman provinces, where the apostles planted churches, and then called them by their names: and thus we see that even the apostles themselves, under the guidance of the blessed SPIRIT, projected such a government for the Church, as in its divisions would be correspondent to those of the civil state: thus, at least, giving an intimation that they would have "diocesan boundaries conform, of course, to those of the states."

We find the same principle pervading the titles of St. Paul's epistles, which are all addressed to some province in general, or to the chief city of that province, or its bishop. Thus, one is written to the Romans, another "to the Church of GOD at Corinth, with all the saints which are at Achaia," and another to the churches of Galatia. Ephesus was the chief city of Proconsular Asia; and writing to the Christians of that province, the title is to the saints which are at Ephesus, i. e. under the jurisdiction of that city. Macedonia was another Roman province, of which Thessalonica was the chief city: thus we find two epistles to the Thessalonians, with directions that they be read "to all the holy brethren," i. e. to all of the whole province. Again, we have two epistles to Timothy and Titus, who were apostles,* says Theodet, the one of the Cretans, the other of the Asiatics; Crete and Proconsular Asia, both being celebrated Roman provinces. So that all St. Paul's epistles were written, either to the churches of some province, or to the chief city or bishop of that province: which plainly shows that St. Paul, in the founding and regulating of churches, designed to conform to the Roman provinces actually existing.

Even while some of the apostles were alive, there were several churches in the several cities of some provinces, and one bishop who presided over the rest, with a jurisdiction commensurate with the bounds of the province. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, we find St. Paul sending to Ephesus to have the presbyters of Asia Proconsularis meet him at Miletus. For, although it is said that he sent to Ephesus, yet it is plain that he sent for the presbyters of the whole province: for when they were come, he said to them, "Ye know that from the first day I came into Asia after what manner I have been with you at all seasons." Nay, he tells those assembled, "that among them he had gone preaching the kingdom of GOD." Now, if those he sent for had been only such as lived at Ephesus, how could he say he had gone preaching among *them*, when Demetrius, the silversmith, accused him, "that not alone at Ephesus, but almost *throughout all Asia*, he had persuaded and turned away much people?" Or, if they had not been, those who lived in all parts of the province, how could they be fit witnesses of his behavior from the first day he came into it? In a word, it seems very probable that this was a visitation of the whole province, and that the presbyters he sent for were pastors of the several cities and churches in it, under the jurisdiction of the bishop residing at Ephesus, who was Timothy, and in St. Paul's company when he sent for the Asian bishops or elders, to Miletus. The transaction, therefore, may be cited as an evidence, that even in the very foundation of the Church it was contemplated that the diocesan boundaries should conform to those of the state.

The example set by the apostles was followed by their successors, who made the boundaries of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction conform to the established divisions of the empire. Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, styles himself in one of his epistles the bishop of Syria, thus intimating that his jurisdiction was bounded by the limits of that province. And his epistle to the Romans is addressed to the Church which has presidency *εν τοπω χοριου Ρωμανων* in the place of the region of the Romans: showing that the bishop of Rome had a similar jurisdiction over the Urbicarian region, another acknowledged division of the empire.

In one of the canons of the Council of Antioch the Παροικιαι or dioceses are assumed to be coextensive with the cities and the regions, or territories, which extended as far as the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate extended.

Socrates Scholasticus, speaking of the general council of Constantinople, says, "that these fathers constituted patriarchs by making a distribution of provinces, so that no bishop should act beyond the bounds of the diocese, which had been done before after a confused and promiscuous manner in the times of persecution." And the words of Theodoret are to the same effect: "They decreed and ordered dioceses, and distributed to every diocese that which did properly belong to it." From a comparison of which passages it appears that the Constantinopolitan fathers appointed patriarchs, and distributed provinces among them, and that consequent upon this distribution was a constitution of dioceses in the Church modelled on the divisions of the state, each diocese containing several provinces.

How far these facts may have a bearing on the case discussed on our first page we leave for others to judge. To us they seem to show that it has been the practice of the Church, from the first, to make the ecclesiastical boundaries conform to the civil boundaries; and if this be admitted to be the rule, it seems a fair inference that a change in the latter involves the propriety of a corresponding change in the former: or to speak to the case in hand, that the jurisdiction of the bishop of Michigan should conform to such limits as are assigned to the State of Michigan.

* Ουτω Φιλιππησιων αποστολος ὁ Επαφροδιτος ην, ὁυτω Κρητων ὁ Τιτος και Ασιανων ὁ Τιμοθεος Αποστολοι.

VERMONT.—We presume the fact of a Convention having been held in this State so early as 1791 is at present generally unknown, and in danger of being entirely forgotten. As we happen to be in possession of an old copy of the Journal, we have thought best to publish it, partly to preserve the memory of the transaction, and partly because it has a bearing on the question discussed in the leading article on our first page.

Journal of the Convention of the Diocese of Vermont in the year 1791.

At a Convention of the clergy and laity belonging to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Vermont, held in Sandgate, February 23, 1791, pursuant to public notice previously given in the Bennington newspaper:

Present, the Rev. James Nichols, of Sandgate; Daniel Barber, of Manchester; Bethuel Chittenden, of Tinmouth. Messrs. Abraham Bristol, Ezra Birch, Samuel Bristol, George Peck, Enoch Basset, Theophilus Hard, John Hard, all of Sandgate. Eleazer Baldwin, of Dorset; Henry Worster, of Paulet; John Pringle, of Hebron. Nathan Canfield, Peleg Stone, Zadock Hard, Ebenezer Leonard, Caleb Dayton, and Andrew Hawley, all of Arlington.

Eleazer Baldwin, Esq., was unanimously called to the chair, and the Rev. Daniel Barber appointed secretary: when the above laity exhibited certificates of delegation from their respective congregations, and took their seats.

The Rev. Thomas Ellison, Rector of St. Peter's, in Albany, State of New York, being present, was requested to take a seat as a member of this Convention.

The following gentlemen from the neighboring congregations, in the State of New York, were also desired to take seats in this Convention, viz.—

Messrs. James Prendergast, of Pittstown; Josiah Masters and Nicholas Masters, of Scaghticoke; Joseph Adams and John Hitchcock, of Kingsbury; Edward Gainer and Elijah Horton, of Cambridge; and Abijah Hubbel, Abraham Veninger, Joel Lake, Cornelius Bristol, and David Bristol, of Camden.

The Convention then adjourned to the house of worship, when the Rev. Thomas Ellison officiated, and afterwards preached.

Three o'clock, P. M.

The thanks of the Convention were unanimously given to the Rev. Thomas Ellison, for his discourse.

The Constitution of "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States" was read over in gross, and then by separate articles, and the sense of the Convention being first taken on each article, it was afterwards

Resolved, That this Convention approve of, and accede to, the said constitution.

The said constitution was then signed by the clergy and lay delegates present, agreeable to its fifth article, viz. "A Protestant Episcopal church, in any of the United States, not now represented, may at any time hereafter be admitted, on acceding to this constitution."

The Convention then proceeded to choose delegates to the General Convention, should it be called before the next meeting of their State Convention, when the following were chosen, viz.

Rev. James Nichols, Daniel Barber, and Bethuel Chittenden, clerical deputies.

Hon. Stephen Roe Bradley, Eleazer Baldwin, Stephen Hard, and Alexander Pennock, Esqrs., lay deputies.

The following sketch of a plan of church government was taken into consideration, and ordered to be minuted for the consideration of the next Convention, viz.

1. The State of Vermont shall be divided into four districts.

2. A clerical and lay deputy to the General Convention shall always be chosen from each district, for the purpose of equalizing the representation.

3. The clergy and lay delegates from the respective congregations in each district, shall hold semi-annual meetings in their respective districts, at which the senior clergyman shall preside, and the minutes of such meetings shall be presented to him by the State Convention, at their stated annual meeting.

4. Whenever a bishop shall be elected to preside over the Church in this State, and he shall make a visitation of the respective congregations in his diocese, he shall also hold a district visitation, that is to say, the clergy and wardens of each parish shall be by him convened at any church in this district he may choose, that he may there charge them with the duties of their respective offices.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning.

February 24th, 9 *o'clock, A. M.*

After prayers, the Convention proceeded to business.

The following members were appointed a Standing Committee, viz.

The Rev. James Nichols, Daniel Barber, and Bethuel Chittenden, Nathan Canfield, Samuel Bristol, and Job Gideon, Esqrs.

A letter was ordered to be addressed to the Right Rev. Samuel, Bishop of Connecticut, recommending the Church of this State to his pastoral regard, until a bishop is elected to preside over it.

The thanks of the Convention were then given to the Rev. Thomas Ellison, for his kind attendance and important services.

Their thanks were also given to the gentlemen from the State of New York, for their brotherly regard in attending this Convention.

After prayers, the Convention adjourned, to meet in St. James' Church, Arlington, on the third Wednesday of next September; invitations to which are to be sent by the Secretary, and notification made as generally as possible.

Extract from the Minutes,
DANIEL BARBER, *Secretary*.

CIRCULAR LETTER.

Manchester, September , 1791.

SIR,—I take this method of notifying you, that a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this State will be holden, in St. James' Church, Arlington, on the third Wednesday of the present month.

If you lay to heart the increase of true religion, and the peace, prosperity, and security of the Protestant Episcopal communion, I have not a doubt but you will exert your best endeavors to have a meeting of the Episcopalians in your town convened, and a delegation sent to the approaching Convention.

No sooner was every obstacle of the union of this State with the other states removed, than the bosoms of the Episcopalians in this quarter glowed with a desire of union with them in ecclesiastical matters also; and a Convention was accordingly held in Sandgate.

It was necessary that the business should be taken up *somewhere*, and it was *there* taken up no farther than was necessary to remove the idea of our being separated from "*the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States*," composed of the churches of *twelve* states.

With this I send you the Minutes of the first Convention; and am, Sir, with a sincere wish for your present and eternal happiness, your affectionate servant in CHRIST, DANIEL BARBER.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—It appears from the Spirit of Missions that the Foreign Committee, deeming it desirable that the claims of their department should be more extensively urged than can be done by the Secretary and General Agent, have appointed four special agents to visit the country for the purpose of adding to the funds, and promoting a just missionary spirit. The persons appointed and their rates of salary may be seen from the annexed resolutions.

Resolved, That several agents be specially appointed for a limited time to present the claims of foreign missions before the Church, both for the purpose of adding to the funds and promoting a just missionary spirit.

Resolved, That the following gentlemen be requested to undertake such services in the regions assigned to them, respectively, viz.—For the Eastern Diocese, Vermont, and Connecticut, the Rev. A. H. Vinton, Rector of Grace Church, Providence; for the western part of New York and Pennsylvania, the Rev. Alonzo Potter, D. D., Professor of Union College, N. Y.; for the Western and South-western States, the Rev. John T. Brooke, Rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati; for the South, with special reference to attending Diocesan Conventions, ——— ———.

Resolved, That the above gentlemen be requested to perform the duties respectively undertaken by them, and to report, prior to the meeting of the Board of Missions in Baltimore, on the 7th of June: and that they be entitled to receive compensation while so employed, at the rate of $1000 per annum each, and their travelling expenses.

THE CHURCHMAN.—The present number completes the sixth year of our paper. Our next number will appear in a larger form, and new type. No exertions, justified by the patronage of the paper, are spared by the proprietors to render it generally acceptable. May we take the liberty on this occasion again to remind those who are in arrears with the Agent, that a settlement of their accounts is of the greatest importance? The Editor hopes also to devote more attention to the editorial department than he has been able to do for a few weeks past.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE.—The Rev. Horatio Potter, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Albany, has been unanimously elected to the Presidency of Washington College, in the place of the Rev. Dr. Wheaton, resigned. We understand that Dr. Wheaton proceeds forthwith to New Orleans, having received an invitation to the Rectorship of the church in that city.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—If our correspondent, "A Layman from the Mohawk," will refresh his memory with the perusal of our paper of December 10, and the Gospel Messenger, shortly after, he will find a reply on the matter of his communication, applicable then. The frankness with which sole responsibility was then avowed indicates the quarter to which reference must be made, if dissatisfaction is still felt; and we need not remind "A Layman" that courtesy, as well as holier considerations, demands that such reference be not *anonymous* through a *public print*; thereby screening the accusing party, and holding up the accused to public opprobrium; or casting on him the imputation, that he would notice an anonymous attack.

CHRIST CHURCH, NORTH HEMPSTEAD.

At a meeting of the friends of the Rev. Moses Marcus, held at the parsonage house, Cow Neck, February 21, 1837, John Morrell, Esq., was called to the chair, and Wessel S. Smith, Esq., appointed Secretary; when the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, That we have learned, with much concern, that the Rev. Moses Marcus has resigned the pastoral charge of Christ Church, North Hempstead, and is about removing from the parish; and whilst we cheerfully bear testimony to the faithful discharge of his ministerial duties, and to his upright and gentlemanly deportment during his short stay among us, we cannot but deplore the causes which have led to this untoward result.

Resolved, That we sincerely regret that the Vestry have deemed it expedient, in order to preserve harmony in the congregation, to recommend to Mr. Marcus to retire from the rectorship of Christ Church.

Resolved, That the many slanderous reports which have been industriously circulated in this community, calculated to injure the fair fame of our pastor, and thereby destroy his usefulness in the parish, have, in our opinion, *no foundation in truth*.

Resolved, That, as Christians, we deeply lament the dissensions and feuds which have but too long disturbed the peace and happiness of this congregation; and we indulge the hope, that there is still among us enough of good sense and leaven of righteousness to correct these unchristian feelings, and that the true spirit of piety, shedding its influence around us, may cause us hereafter to live like Christians, in *unity, peace, and concord*.

Resolved, That the Rev. Moses Marcus, in leaving this parish, carries with him our best wishes for his health and happiness; and that, wherever his lot may hereafter be cast, we fervently hope that brighter days and fairer prospects may await him.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, signed by the Chairman and Secretary of this meeting, be presented to our esteemed pastor.

Signed, JOHN MORRELL, *Chairman*.
WESSEL S. SMITH, *Secretary*
Parsonage House, Cow Neck, Feb. 21, 1837.

INTELLIGENCE.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR CONFIRMATION IN NEW YORK AND BROOKLYN.

Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 12, St. Clement's Church.

Sunday next before Easter, March 19, French Church, Du St. Esprit

First Sunday after Easter, April 2, St. Peter's Church, A. M., Zion Church, P. M.

Second Sunday after Easter, April 9, St. Luke's Church.

Third Sunday after Easter, April 16, Mission Church of the Holy Evangelists.

Fourth Sunday after Easter, April 23, Mission Church of the Epiphany.

Fifth Sunday after Easter, April 30, Trinity Church, *Brooklyn*.

EPISCOPAL ACTS BY THE BISHOP OF THIS DIOCESE.—Wednesday, March 1, in St. George's Church, Flushing, Queen's county, admitted John B. Kerfoot, an instructer, and formerly a pupil of the Flushing Institute, to Deacons' Orders. Morning prayer was read by the Rev. William A. Muhlenberg, D. D., principal of the Institute, (who also presented the candidate,) assisted by the Rev. Jacob W. Diller, assistant minister of St. John's Church, Brooklyn, who read the lessons, and the sermon preached by the Bishop, who was assisted in the administration of the communion by the rector of the parish, the Rev. Robert B. Van Kleeck.

Friday, March 3, at a special confirmation in Trinity Church, in this city, confirmed one.

Fourth Sunday in Lent, March 5, in the Mission Church of the Epiphany, in this city, admitted George Mills to Deacons' Orders. Morning prayer was read, and the candidate presented by the Rev. Lot Jones, the missionary of the station, and the sermon preached by the Bishop. Mr. Mills has entered on his duties as minister of the recently organized German Church of St. Timothy, in this city.*

*An edition of the Book of Common Prayer, in the German language, is now in a course of preparation by a committee of the General Convention, the Rev. Christian F. Crusé, of Pennsylvania, a ripe German scholar, having, as chairman of a sub-committee, the principal charge of the matter. It is hoped that the volume will be published in a few months. Meanwhile, to meet the present emergency of the above mentioned church, a small edition of the morning and evening prayer, litany, and catechism, has been printed in tract form to be superseded by the standard book when that appears.

At a meeting of the friends of the Church, held at the Commissioners' Hall, Kensington, on Tuesday evening, the 14th instant, for the purpose of organizing an Episcopal congregation, the Rev. C. Wiltberger was called to the chair, and Thomas H. Powers, Esq., appointed secretary.

The meeting having been opened with prayer by the chairman, on motion, it was

Resolved, That we deem it expedient at this time to organize a congregation in connexion with the Protestant Episcopal Church in this diocese, to be called Emmanuel Church.

Resolved, that it is expedient, and that we do now proceed to the election of twelve persons to serve as vestrymen until Easter Monday. The following persons were duly elected, viz.

Clement Cresson, A. G. Coffin, G. M. Eldridge, Joshua Cowpland, Frederick Guion, H. W. Chadwick, Thomas H. Powers, John Ridley, Jacob Mattis, Robert King, Richard Jackson, Wm. H. Peberdy.

Resolved, That, as the erection of a building for the worship of ALMIGHTY GOD is highly desirable, in reliance on Divine assistance, we will exert our influence for the accomplishment of so commendable an object.

It being then proposed, the persons composing the meeting came forward, and gave pledges for the sum of $400 toward the erection of a building.

The meeting having then adjourned, the vestry proceeded to the election of a rector, when the Rev. C. Wiltberger was duly elected rector of Emmanuel Church.

They also elected Clement Cresson and Richard Jackson as churchwardens, John Ridley as secretary, and Thomas H. Powers as treasurer of the vestry.

THOMAS H. POWERS, *Secretary*.
Episcopal Recorder.

Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society.—We have received the Spirit of Missions for January. From the proceedings of the Domestic Committee inserted in this number, we gather the following items of intelligence, in addition to the notices which have already appeared in the Observer.

The Rev. Lucien B. Wright has been appointed missionary at Demopolis and the Forks, in the State of Alabama, instead of Livingston, his former station.

Chicago, in the Diocese of Illinois, has ceased to be a missionary station, in consequence of the Episcopal congregation in that place having succeeded in erecting a neat and commodious house of worship, and agreed to contribute one thousand dollars per annum for the support of their clergyman.

The Rev. Sherlock A. Bronson has resigned the appointment of missionary to Lancaster and Somerset, in this Diocese.

The Rev. Gershom P. Waldo, of the Diocese of New York, has been appointed missionary to Memphis, in the Diocese of Tennessee.

A collection after sermon was taken up, on the 20th of November, in St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, for domestic missions, amounting to $717; and on the 11th of December a collection was taken up, in the Church of the Ascension, New York city, for the same object, amounting to $1022 07. These are the largest plate collections that have ever been made in aid of the domestic department of our Missionary Society.

Don Alonzo Cushman, Esq., has been elected a member of the Domestic Committee to supply the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Hudson Blake, Esq.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop Griswold, of the Eastern Diocese, has been appointed to preach the annual sermon before the Board of Missions, at their annual meeting, in June next; and the Rev. James T. Johnson, of the Diocese of Virginia, has been chosen his substitute.

The Rev. Dr. Milnor has been elected a member of the Foreign Committee, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of the Rev. Mr. Forbes.
Gambier Observer.

The History of the Popes of Rome and of Popery. The Rev. John Waterman and Mr. David Christie, of Oxford, Ohio, propose publishing a work under the foregoing title, composed of Bower's History of the Popes, the History of the Spiritual Monarchy, by Baron Puffendorff; a view of the Papal System by Southey; and the Observations of Sir Isaac Newton on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse, closing with an original appendix. It will be published in semi-monthly numbers, each containing 16 pages imperial octavo, making three volumes of four hundred pages each. The price to subscribers will be two dollars per volume, payable in advance.—*Western Christian Advocate.*

Theological Seminary of the Diocese of Virginia.—From the catalogue of this institution, which has recently been published, we learn that the number of its students is twenty-nine, of whom six are in the senior, twelve in the middle, and eleven in the junior class. The bishop of the Diocese is president of the faculty, and the following are the resident professors: Rev. Ruel Keith, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Instructer of Pulpit Eloquence; Rev. Edward R. Lippitt, A. M., Professor of Pastoral Theology and Church Polity, and Instructer of Ecclesiastical History; Rev. Joseph Packard, A. M., Professor of Biblical Literature.

Appended to the catalogue are the names of the alumni, ninety-eight in number, or nearly one-eighth of the whole number of ministers in the Church. If such has been the number of students educated in past years, when there were but two professors, whose whole time was devoted to their instruction, we may anticipate for it much more enlarged usefulness under its present arrangement.—*Southern Churchman.*

NOTICES.

NOTICE is hereby given that the following persons have been duly appointed agents of "The Churchman," at their respective residences: Rev. E. E. Ford, of Augusta, Georgia; Mr. Arius Nye, Cashier of the Bank of Marietta, Ohio; Mr. Z. Clark, Bookseller, Troy, New York.

YOUNG MEN'S AUXILIARY EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

A SERMON (being the third of a series to be delivered monthly during the season) will be preached by the Right Rev. Bishop Doane, before the Young Men's (Auxiliary) Education and Missionary Society on Sunday evening, 12th instant, in St. Bartholomew's Church. Service to commence at half-past seven o'clock. A collection will be taken up in aid of the funds of the Society.

THE Board of Managers of the "Young Men's Auxiliary Education and Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the City of New York" will meet in the basement of Christ Church, on Thursday evening, the 16th instant, at half-past seven o'clock.

The members of the *Society* are invited to be present. By order of the Board,
CHARLES W. CARMER, *Rec. Sec.*
New York, March 11, 1837.

REV. MR. COLTON'S next lecture to young men, (to-morrow evening,) at the Lyceum of Natural History, will be on *sobriety in religion as opposed to fanaticism*. Services, as usual, at half-past ten, A. M., and seven, P. M.

A SPECIAL meeting of the Board of Managers of the New York Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Society will be held on Thursday evening next, 16th instant, at the Sunday school room of St. John's Chapel, at half-past seven o'clock, P. M.

By order of the President,
THERON WILBER, *Secretary*.
March 8, 1837.

OBITUARY.

DIED,—On Tuesday, Feb. 28, at the residence of her son-in-law, Archibald Gracie, Mrs. Bethune, widow of the late Angus Bethune, of Charleston, S. C., aged fifty-five years.

Calendar.

MARCH.

12. Fifth Sunday in Lent.
19. Sunday before Easter.
20. Monday before Easter.
21. Tuesday before Easter.
22. Wednesday before Easter.
23. Thursday before Easter.
24. Good Friday.
25. Easter-eve and the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin.
26. EASTER DAY.
27. Monday in Easter-Week.
28. Tuesday in Easter-Week.

APRIL.

2. First Sunday after Easter.
9. Second Sunday after Easter.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

SINCE the last public acknowledgment, the Committee have received:—

Remittance from Rev. John A. Hicks, rector of Trinity Church, Rutland, Vt., from his congregation, for Greece, $5 00; general purposes, 22 00; and from his Sunday school, for Mrs. Robertson's school, Greece, 8 00, making $35 00.

Remittance from Right Rev. Bishop Doane, offerings of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N. J., for Africa, 6 00; Persia, 11 00—Collection in said church (4th July) for Persia, 30 10—Collection in Trinity Church, Woodbridge (4th July) for Persia, 6 37—Offerings of St. Mark's Church, Orange, for foreign missions 0 75—Offerings of St. Peter's Church, Morristown, do., 3 10—A little boy, for China, 1 00—Miss Smith, Ross Hall, for Africa, 15 00, making 72 22.

Remittance from Thomas Robins, Esq., agent, Philadelphia, from the church in Churchtown, Lancaster county, 14 37—From the church in Morgantown, Berks county, per Rev. Levi Bull, 5 00, all for Greek mission—From the Female Society for the Promotion of Religion of St. Andrew's Church, Philadelphia, per Miss P. W. Thurston, Treasurer, for Greek mission, 50 00, and for African mission 50 00, $100 00, making 119 37.

Monthly offerings of St. George's Church, Hempstead, L. I., by the Rev. W. M. Carmichael, rector, 5 61.

Total receipts, $232 30.
CHARLES J. ALDIS, *Acting Treasurer.*
March 8, 1837.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

THE Treasurer of the Domestic Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Missionary Society acknowledges the receipt of the following contributions since his report of the 28th February.

By the hands of Mr. Charles Benton, Christmas offering of St. John's Church, Salisbury, Conn., for Michigan, received from the Rev. Lucius M. Purdy, 7 00—By the same hands, Christmas offering of St. Paul's Church, Sharon, Conn., for Michigan, received from the Rev. Lucius M. Purdy, 4 00—From the Rev. Samuel C. Stratton, rector of Trinity Church, Newton, Conn., being balance of church offerings in that congregation for last year, in aid of missions in Bishop Kemper's Diocese, 5 00—From monthly offerings of St. George's Church, Hempstead, L. I., by the hands of the rector, the Rev. William M. Carmichael, 20 40.

By the hands of the Right Rev. Bishop Doane, offerings of St. Peter's Church, Morristown, N. J., for domestic missions, 0 75—By the same hands, received from Miss Smith, Ross Hall, N. J., for missions in the West, 15 00.

By the hands of Thomas Robins, Esq., Receiving Agent in Philadelphia, received from the Female Sunday school of St. Andrew's Church, Mount Holly, N. J., their first annual payment for the education of an Indian girl at Green Bay school, to be named Elizabeth Kempton, per Catharine Clark, 30 00—From Margaret C. Peyton, Fauquier county, Va., for general purposes, 10 00—Misses Williamina E. Smith, and Rebecca Smith, their annual subscription for 1837, for domestic missions, 6 00—William W. Johnston, Esq., Princess Ann, Maryland, for general purposes, 9 00—Collection in Christ Church, Philadelphia, on Sunday, 5th February, 1837, after a sermon by the Rev. Mr. Dorr, Secretary and General Agent of the Domestic Committee, for domestic missions, per Moses Kempton, Esq., 178 80—From Mrs. Dorcas M. Dupont, of Brandywine, Delaware, for general purposes, per the Rev. William C. Russell, 10 00.

Total, $295 95.
March 8, 1837. JAMES SWORDS, *Treasurer.*

CITY MISSION.

THE subscriber, as missionary of the Church of the Epiphany, very gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following donations for the poor:—

From Mrs. Elizabeth Fish, $5 00, and twelve pairs of woollen socks—From Mrs. Daniel Le Roy, 5 00—Miss Mary Augusta Le Roy, 2 50—Rev. William L. Johnson, Jamaica, L. I., $5 00—John Ridley, Esq., 5 00—Peter G. Stuyvesant, Esq., 25 00—From a Sunday school teacher, 2 50—William H. Townsend, Esq., 2 50—Richard E. Mount, Esq., 5 00—Miss Tucker, 5 00—C. J. Aldis, Esq., $10 00—Miss C. Osborn, 3 00, "for a special case of suffering"—Robert T. Haws, Esq., 5 00—A widow's mite, 2 00—"A resident of Brooklyn," 10 00.

By J. McVickar, D. D., from Miss Bard, 3 00.

By Robert Gracie, Esq., from Edward S. Gould, Esq., 10 00.

By Swords, Stanford & Co., from "A lady of St. John's Chapel," 5 00—"A lady of St. Paul's Chapel," 2 00—"A lady of Trinity Church," 5 00—Mrs. Daniels, 3 00—Mrs. R., 10 00—Mr. B., 5 00—An unknown friend, 5 00.

Through the Protestant Episcopal Press, from "A. B.," 10 00.

March 7, 1837. LOT JONES, 192 Allen-street.

FIRST MISSION STATION.

THE subscriber desires to correct an acknowledgment of last week. For $3 00 from P. M. P., it should have been $5 00 from M. P. M., through the Agent of the Protestant Episcopal Press.

ALEXANDER FRAZER, 341 Pearl-street.
March 8, 1837.

P. S. The missionary would earnestly solicit a continuance of the liberality of the friends of the poor, as this is a season of uncommon suffering among the poor of this city, so that the missionary in his visits to the habitations of that class meets with the most heart-rending cases of sickness, poverty, and distress. Any donations will be thankfully received by the missionary, 341 Pearl-street, or by the Agent of the Protestant Episcopal Press, 28 Ann-street. A. F.

THIRD STATION.

THE subscriber thankfully acknowledges the receipt of $25 00, from P. G. Stuyvesant, for the benefit of the poor—Also from P. Dater, 5 00—From Miss O., of Christ Church, $2 00.

E. B. KELLOGG, Missionary,
New York, March 8, 1837. 401 Hudson-street.

ILLINOIS.

SUBJECT to the order of Bishop Chase, New York Auxiliary Bible and Common Prayer-book Society, 200 Prayer-books—Rev. Dr. Anthon, 50 do.—Do., $5 00—Haynes Lord, 5 copies of the Churchman's Manual—A lady of the Church of the Ascension, 5 00—H. Cotheal, 5 00—Rev. J. C. Richmond, 5 00—F. De Peyster, 5 00—Mrs. G. 1 00—Emily S. G., 0 50—Elizabeth J. G., 0 50—Rev. L. Carter, 5 00—Mrs. P. Lord, 5 00.

March 8, 1837. F. H. CUMING.

FREE COLORED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to the Protestant Episcopal Free Church of the people of color:—

Dr. Stevens, 10 00—Mrs. Dr. Stevens, 5 00—Christopher Wolfe, 20 00. Total, 35 00.

Subscriptions may be left at the store of William Hinton, 194 Broadway.

YOUNG MEN'S AUXILIARY EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

THE Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following, viz.—

From subscribers, $9 50—Donors, 1 50—C. W. Carmer, to constitute himself a life member, 15 00—Rev. J. F. Schroeder, D. D., being the amount of two quarterly payments of 25 00, $50 00. Total, $76 00.

WM. H. TOWNSEND, *Treasurer*,
March 8, 1837. 166 Barrow-street, and Bank of America.

PRESS DEPOSITORY,
28 *Ann-street.*

Letters have been received at the N. Y. Prot. Episcopal Press during the week ending March 9th, from the following persons, viz.

Robert Graffin—Postmaster, Portsmouth—F. Randall—S. M. Buckingham, *with remit.*—Joseph Whetham—H. & E. Phinney—Postmaster, Norwalk—Postmaster, Natchez, Miss., J. S. Merrin.

Received by the Gen. Prot. Episc. S. S. Union.

S. Babcock—William Grant—Thomas Latimer, 2—G. W. Donohue—Belknap & Hammersley—Hugh D. Evans, *with remit.*—Miss M. Cox.

PRIVATE TUTOR.

A CLERGYMAN of the Protestant Episcopal Church, being prevented by circumstances from at present taking a parish, would be willing to devote his time for a part of each day to the instructions of the children of a family. He is competent to give lessons in all the ordinary branches of an English education; the Italian, French, German, and Spanish languages, the Greek and Latin classics, and if desired, in the Hebrew. It may be proper to add, that he has been for some years past engaged in teaching.

Reference can be made to the following gentlemen, who will give the necessary information:—The Right Rev. Bishop B. T. Onderdonk, Rev. Dr. Hawks, Rev. W. R. Whittingham, Rev. William J. Kip.

SUPERINTENDENTS of Sunday schools can be supplied with extra copies of the psalm to be sung at the approaching anniversary of the New York Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Society, by calling at the Depository of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, 28 Ann street.

From the Colonial Churchman.

Naaman the Syrian.

BY J. JACOB.

Bravest in battle field—in hall,
'Mid Syria's princely clan;
Wisest, and most renowned of all,
Was favored Naaman;
But all his lordly power and fame
Could not secure his mortal frame
From mortals' dreadful ban;
High though his titles, great his soul,
The warrior was a leper foul.

His little captive Hebrew maid
Of Israel's prophet told;
"Would but my master seek his aid,
He'd not his aid withhold."
From Syria in his stately car
Came down the mighty man of war
Laden with gifts of gold;
And stood in all the pomp of power
Expectant at the prophet's door.

But, lo! no fawning prophet came,
To please the Syrian's pride,
A message in Elisha's name,
Obsequious forms supplied.
"If from this hour thou would'st be free
From thy polluting leprosy,
Go wash in Jordan's tide."
High rose the wrath in Naaman's breast,
He scorned t' observe the mean request.

"And is it this for which I came?
And shall I stoop so low?
What! wash in Jordan's puny stream?
Insulting prophet!—no.
Through Syrian vales of sylvan song,
Far purer rivers roll along
Than all thy lands can show.
Why may I not to them repair,
And wash, and leave my foulness there?"

He said—then madly turned away;
His homeward path pursued;
Till by his servants urged to stay,
And check his ireful mood:
He listened to his faithful men,
In Jordan dipped—and lo! was clean.
Then full of gratitude,
Came back the prophet to reward,
And praise the goodness of the Lord.

Sinner, behold thy madness here,
Thou art unclean—unclean;
Yet, though thy Saviour's blood is near
To wash away thy sin,
Thou view'st it with a scornful frown,
And seekest fountains of thy own;
Proud leper, think again:
Hear—hear the voice that speaks to thee,
Wash from thy fatal leprosy.

From the Episcopal Recorder.

To the Clergy, the Superintendents of Sunday schools, and the Congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

Dear Brethren,—The command of the Saviour to his disciples, "Suffer little children to come unto *me*, and forbid them not," has been regarded in all ages of the Church as quite a sufficient sanction for the reception of children into the Christian Church by baptism, and for early and diligent efforts to bring them up in the fear and nurture of the Lord.

The spiritual interests of this interesting portion of the Church—the lambs of the flock in this diocese—so far as they are connected with Sunday school instruction, are intrusted in some degree to the fostering care of our Diocesan Sunday School Society.

In their behalf we address you at this time:—

In the present attitude of the Church and of the religious world in relation thereto, the Board of Managers of our Society deem it of intense importance to the children of our Sunday schools, and to the cause of Christ, as held by our Church, that decided efforts should be made to imbue the minds of the Sunday scholars with correct knowledge of the true nature and claims of the Church of our affections, and with attachment to her distinctive principles and features. It is believed that an anxious feeling pervades the bosoms of the clergy generally, and of a very large body of the laity also, for the accomplishment of this object, as one of commanding interest and of fundamental moment to the influence and perpetuity of sound doctrine and holy practice in the religious world.

With affectionate earnestness the Board would present to you,

First, some views which seem to them to call for especial attention to the subject of training up our Sunday scholars not only as Christians, but as Episcopalian Christians; of presenting religion to them in sacred alliance with the Church.

Secondly, a brief statement of some measures for the better accomplishment of this object.

I. In offering the reasons which demand especial attention to this subject we state:—

(1.) As a primary one, that the pastors of the Church generally feel and acknowledge that the prevailing modes of instruction do not produce the desired effect. The instruction given is more or less vague, touching usually on little else than the great truths and duties of the Gospel, (points never to be neglected,) but seldom presenting the Church to the view of the children in her attractive features, seldom walking with them about Zion, seldom unfolding her excellences or her strength, seldom in fact exhibiting her to the youthful mind as an object of love and duty, in that broad light of obligation and affection in which it is essential that she should stand in the judgments and consciences of the young, in order to preserve them attached to her in purity of faith, in energy of zeal, and in holiness of practice.

(2.) Again the results of Sunday school influence on the youthful mind evince the defectiveness of the prevailing modes of instruction. Very many, perhaps a majority, in some cases a very large majority, of the children who are drawn from irreligious associations into our schools, when they reach the age of puberty at which attendance on the school as children becomes irksome, or, in their own language, when they "are too old to attend Sunday school," seldom attach themselves to the Church, discontinue attendance on its worship, fall into utter indifference, or sinful associations and companies, or go off into other, and sometimes into questionable folds. Why is this? Because they have not become attached to the Church of Christ. Because she is not seated in their affections. Because their judgments and consciences have not been enlisted in her favor. Because no pains have been taken to habituate them to her mode of worship, or to make them understand their duties and obligations to her holy cause. Hence, when dissevered from the Sunday schools of the Church, an event which occurs at the most assailable period of their age, when the world throws open to their excited vision its gilded vices, sensual allurements, and flattering associations and objects, at this very crisis of spiritual danger, they cease to attend her sanctuaries of prayer, cast aside religious studies, drop into the broad current of worldliness, and soon forget—amongst vicious companions, daily temptations, and the prompting of an evil nature—the vague and general instruction communicated in the Sunday school. They have learned the morals and doctrines of religion, but never having associated them with the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth, in ceasing to attend the latter, they forget and disregard the influence of the former. How few of the many hundred Sunday scholars that attend our schools, especially among the poor, become regular attendants of our churches! How few, comparatively, join our communion! How common is the deep-drawn sigh and wondering regret of our Sunday school teachers on this account! In nine cases out of ten the accessions to our communion from among our Sunday scholars come from that class of them who, by *parental* guidance, example, and teaching, are led to it, rather than by the influence of what they are taught in the schools. Many, when they become serious, join other communions, not the Church. There would be less pain in this operation of the prevailing system, if, in all cases, connexions were formed with the sound and orthodox denominations around us. But, alas! in many cases, we have to deplore and to admit that "we have labored," and the Universalist and the Unitarian "have entered into our labors." All this is owing to a loose attachment to the Church; and loose attachment to the Church is owing to loose and imperfect teaching in relation to its nature, claims, and objects.

(3.) It seems to the Board also, that the obvious demands of *duty* exact of us that our Sunday scholars should be trained up as Episcopalians, with a riveted attachment to the Church. Duty to *them* exacts it. What have we in view but their moral welfare, their spiritual and eternal good? Will not these be *best* promoted by such a course? If we entrench them in the Church, fill their memories with her doctrines and devotions, their lips with her praises, their judgments with her claims and excellences, and keep them in the courts of the Lord's house, surely we have done something for their prospective good. If we think that the Church holds the truths of the Gospel and the way of eternal life, how can we be said to have discharged our duty to those whom God's providence commits to us, if we fail to attach them to that Church, established by our Lord as an ark of spiritual safety to his people?

Duty to the parents exacts the same thing of us, for whether Episcopalians themselves or not, they commit their offspring to our tuition in the belief that in Episcopal Sunday schools their children will acquire the views and be made attached to the principles and usages of the Protestant Episcopal Church. And have they not just ground of complaint if, in this respect, we be found wanting?

Duty to the Church is equally cogent; for, having provided instruction for the young, and commended them to our care, we promote neither her interest, nor her reputation, nor her stability, by disregarding or thwarting her designs.

Duty to God our Saviour adds its weighty sanction to the whole: for having established his Church as one means of keeping us to the faith and holiness of the Gospel, how shall we answer at the final day, for venturing to dissever what he has, in his almighty wisdom, joined together; for attempting to make and keep his lambs attached to him without employing *His* appointed means to secure them from straying from the fold?

The Board might easily enlarge upon this branch of the subject; but they trust that in the views presented they have supplied their brethren in the diocese with sufficient reasons to enforce on them the immediate adoption of the following *measures*, through which they conceive a great improvement in our Sunday schools, and some remedy for the evils above stated, may be obtained.

II. In humble dependence on the Divine blessing, and with earnest petitions for the guidance of the Spirit of Christ, they would affectionately recommend:—

1. That the pastors of the churches, who are properly the authorized and responsible heads of the respective Sunday schools, should apply their thoughts, prayers, and efforts to this important bearing of the Sunday school enterprise. With their concurrence and exertions all can be effected. Unless they lead the way neither flock nor lambs will follow.

2. That the Sunday schools should, in all cases, be connected with the Diocesan Sunday School Society, and, through it, with the General Episcopal Sunday School Union, and that a stated collection in behalf of the Diocesan Society be made in every church, to enable it to distribute Episcopal Sunday school books among the feebler schools and parishes.

3. That the books of instruction, the system adopted, and the volumes for the library, should be, as far as practicable, of a kind calculated to imbue the minds of the scholars with correct views of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church.

4. That liturgical and responsive services be always used in the opening and closing devotions of the school.

5. That frequently the school should go through with the pastor or the superintendent the *whole morning or evening service*, with a view to familiarizing them to the use of the Prayer-book, to finding the places, to making audible responses, and to uniting personally in the devotions of the Church.

6. That the pastor, and superintendent as deputed by him, should see that proper efforts are made to have every scholar taught, by heart, the *Confession*, the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Creed*, the *Commandments*, and the *Catechism;* thus supplying them with the rich material of Christian doctrine and Christian morals against that day when the Spirit of God may wake them effectually to the exercise of repentance toward God and faith in Christ.

7. That besides the general biblical instruction of the school, and the formation of juvenile Bible classes, a class be formed for instruction in the Prayer-book; so that, in addition to the use of the Prayer-book, the meaning and reason of its formularies be better understood; and the children be taught their proper relations and duties to the Church of Christ, and the grounds of its distinctive organization, features, and action.

8. That every Sunday school teacher should feel it to be his duty to prepare himself to instruct his scholars in the principles, doctrines, and usages of the Church; and labor to attach them to it as the best means, under God, of preserving them in the true faith of his holy name.

The Board have thus, in the fulfilment of their duty, submitted to you their views and suggestions. They are of a practical character. The clergy and the superintendents of our schools can render them effective. The moral good and the eternal salvation of the Sunday scholars of the Church is the end of the Sunday school enterprise. We have suggested to you some additional MEANS for securing that end. We commend these *means* to your consideration and action, with the earnest prayer that the blessing of Christ our Master may attend them, and his Holy Spirit be our prompter and guide in all efforts to promote the glory of God, the good of his Church, and the salvation of our fellow-men.

In behalf of the Board,

H. U. Onderdonk, *President.*

John B. Clemson, *Corresponding Secretary.*

January 12, 1837.

With a view to information the Board would present the following statements:—

1. The funds collected for our Society and all donations to it may be forwarded to Mr. George Hawkins, Treasurer, South Tenth-street, first door below South-street, Philadelphia.

2. Correspondence with our Society is to be held through the Chairman of the Executive Committee, Rev. John B. Clemson, or the Recording Secretary, Mr. William Robinson, 384 Market-street.

3. Application for donations of books to be made to the Chairman of the Executive Committee, Rev. John B. Clemson, Eleventh-street, first door below Lombard-street, Philadelphia.

4. For the purchase of Protestant Episcopal Sunday school books, for instruction and libraries, apply to Mr. Thomas Latimer, No. 102 South Third-street.

5. Applications for donations of Prayer-books to be made to the Rev. Dr. Ducachet, No. 8 Girard Place, Philadelphia, or to Dr. S. Littell, Corresponding Secretary of the same, North Ninth-street, above Race.

6. As books calculated to improve and qualify Sunday school teachers for teaching the doctrines, usages, principles, and discipline of the Church, the Board would enumerate, among many others which might be named, the following, viz., Wilmer's Episcopal Manual, Chapman's Sermons, Clark's Walk About Zion, Episcopacy Tested by Scripture, Episcopacy Examined and Re-examined, Hobart on Confirmation, Tyng on Confirmation, Dehon on Confirmation, Henshaw on Confirmation, An Introduction to the Common Prayer, Reasons for being a Churchman, (a tract,) Forms Opposed to Formality, (a tract,) Bishop White's Lectures, Hobart's Companion to the Book of Common Prayer. Standard Works, published by the Protestant Episcopal Press:—Dorr's Churchman's Manual, Nelson's Festivals and Fasts, the Old Paths, or the Apostolic Church, (a tract,) Hopkin's Primitive Church, A Candid Examination of the Episcopal Church, Pastor's Testimony, Colton on the Religious State of the Country, Brittain's Apology, Cooke on Episcopacy, Caswall's History of the Church.

7. Books to be used by the scholars with the same view—any of the publications of the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union.

From the Bishop of Nova Scotia's Report of a Visit to Bermudas in the year 1835.

VISIT OF THE BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA TO BERMUDAS.

Sunday, *May* 31.—A very hot day. At the particular desire of the admiral I had engaged once more to preach for the convicts, and his barge was sent for me at eight o'clock, in which I proceeded to the dockyard, where, at half-past nine, I preached to nearly five hundred convicts on board the Coromandel, belonging to that ship and to the Weymouth. Immediately after this I preached to three hundred other convicts on board the Dromedary, where I was attended by all the officers and laborers of the dockyard, who had been assembled at their chapel, but for my convenience came on board the ship. The responses and singing of the convicts were very creditable to them. I was anxious, under the Divine blessing, to be useful to my hearers, and as well as I was able, adapted all I had to say to their peculiar circumstances. I never had more attentive congregations. Many showed excellent feeling, which was particularly excited, with many tears, when their hopes were directed to their return, as faithful penitents, to their country, their kindred, and their home. Nor did I fail to endeavor to raise still higher hopes, and point them to a heavenly home, and the society of angels, and the perfected spirits of the just. We then proceeded about three miles, partly on foot, but chiefly in a boat, through the beautiful scenery of Mangrove Bay, to the church at Somerset, which was closely crowded. I preached again, and affectionately bade farewell from the pulpit to this affectionate people, and confirmed a person who had not been able to attend me before. After this, we had to walk two miles to Mr. Basden's, who had long been one of the Society's valuable schoolmasters, and here we rested for the night.

Tuesday, June 2, was occupied, in part, by attending the sale of every variety of article produced or manufactured in the islands, which are collected by a benevolent and judicious society of ladies, for promoting industry among the poor, whom they greatly relieve and assist by their charitable help and attention. The remainder of the day was devoted to intercourse with many excellent persons, from whom I was soon to be separated.

Wednesday, June 3.—A very busy day. In the morning we met a large congregation at the church in Devonshire parish, where I preached on the leprosy of sin. From hence I had to return to the archdeacon's, who, with Mrs. Spencer, were now happily so far recovered from very dangerous illness, as to be able, though not without a serious effort, to go to Pagets, the nearest church; where, by his request, I married a very interesting person, who had been often an inmate in his family; but I was obliged to hurry from the friends whom this marriage had assembled, and proceed to keep an appointment at the church in Smith's parish, where I met a large congregation, whose faith and holiness it was my desire and endeavor to establish and increase. After the service we had time to visit a remarkable rock on the south shore, marked with some rude letters, not easily distinguished at present, of which B is one, and with a cross, and the figures 1543; probably the date of Bermudas' shipwreck on these islands.

Friday, June 5.—A beautiful morning, (though hot,) which enabled me to be early in preparation for a busy day. I first wrote an answer to an affectionate address presented to me by a very respectable portion of the inhabitants of every parish in this archdeaconry. I proceeded from the Royal Oak, on board of which I had slept, five miles to my lodgings, where I had much to occupy me; then received the subscriptions of Mr. Wood, a candidate for Deacons' Orders, and proceeded with him to the church at Pagets, where I ordained him, and preached upon the occasion. The church was crowded, and I administered the Lord's supper to more than eighty communicants, including the acting governor and his lady, and several members of council. We were four hours in church, and I was greatly hurried afterward, in preparing for embarkation at six o'clock. From the time of my arrival, the admiral had very kindly expressed his desire that I should return with him and his family in the flag-ship, for whose sailing he early named this day. At first I feared this arrangement would delay my return too long; but, as these memoranda will show, abundant occupation was found for me, and I gladly availed myself of a conveyance, in every respect most desirable. I therefore now embarked in the President, attended, to the last moment, by my affectionate clergy, and many of the laity, with similar kindness.

It is impossible for me to close this report without expressions of warmest gratitude for the many comforts and mercies imparted to me during my visitation. Although it was impossible not to feel some inconvenience from the great change of climate, which compelled me to use more caution than ordinary for the preservation of health, I was not interrupted in the performance of any duty by indisposition or by weather. Whenever we had rain, it fell at night; and there was not one day in which we had not clear sunshine. A lovelier season had never been known in these islands of perpetual summer. I was enabled to deliver thirty-two sermons or addresses; to have eleven confirmations, at which 302 white and 360 colored persons were confirmed; to consecrate one church and one burial-ground, and to ordain a deacon as missionary to the colored people. I have reason to hope that, through the heavenly blessing, the religious improvement of the islands is advancing, and that all the progress that can be reasonably expected has been made, and will continue to advance, in the intelligent and religious instruction of the people of color, many of whom already show a proper sense of the benefits and blessings which are benevolently extended to them. In my first visit to Bermudas in 1826, (which was the first episcopal visit to that colony,) when the population of the islands was nearly 11,000, I confirmed 1171 white persons, and 104 colored; in 1830, 289 white persons, and 130 colored; in 1835, 302 white persons, and 360 colored.

The population now is only between nine and ten thousand. It is also a most gratifying circumstance, that, under the Divine favor, the efforts for procuring increased religious instruction, by the enlargement of churches, by the building of school-houses and chapels, which is now proceeding, and by the employment of two well-qualified missionaries, and the prospect of obtaining a third for the special benefit of the people of color, have thus far been eminently successful. While the Society, according to their means, are aiding in this good work, the benevolence of the Legislature in Bermudas and of many pious individuals there, is co-operating with them. The provision for these missionaries is unhappily insufficient; but we will hope that, through the blessing of God, a door will be opened for some increase to the bounty which is promoting this work of Christian love. I feel assured it will have all the aid which the Society can spare, and that it will be forwarded by their prayers. That every thing may be done in that order, and uniformity, and affectionate fellowship which are essential to the beauty of holiness, the missionaries are engaged as curates by the rectors in whose parishes they are to labor; and thus, too, the affections of the colored people for their rectors and their parish churches will be undiminished by the warm attachment which we may hope will be excited toward their missionaries and their chapels, an object which I have considered it very important to promote. I thought the affection which was formed toward the objects of my care in Bermudas, by my first and second visits to them, could hardly be increased; but the tie thus formed seems to be strengthened by every renewal of our intercourse, and it is my earnest prayer that this intercourse may be greatly blessed to them and to myself.

Saturday, June 6.—By the direction of the admiral all who were to sail in the President slept on board last night; and at an early hour of a most lovely morning, the ship was gliding past the beautiful shore of Bermudas, accompanied by the Vestal frigate and an armed schooner, which soon steered for the West Indies. We quickly passed all the narrow channels, favored by a fair wind, and were on the ocean, which now seemed as smooth as the waters of a harbor, before seven o'clock. A most agreeable and rapid passage of five days, in which we partook of every comfort that can be enjoyed in the most perfect ship, managed with the greatest skill and ability, a passage enlivened by very engaging society, and rendered happy by the unbounded kindness of all on board, brought us to Halifax on the morning of Thursday, the 11th of June, when I landed, and, as I would humbly trust, grateful for the blessings which had been imparted to me in the last two months.—*Colonial Churchman.*

From the Episcopal Recorder.

JUSTIFICATION—PROGRESSIVE.

Mr. Editor,—Your correspondent P. censures my piece on this subject, published in the Protestant Episcopalian for September last, and subsequently in the Churchman. His first charge is, that it "appears not to be consistent in its several parts;" an imputation which I cannot refute in your paper without asking you to republish the whole. This, indeed, will be but fair, if the piece is to undergo further discussion in your columns.

His next objection is, that its doctrine is opposed to the standards and standard authors of our Church. As to the standards: he quotes the eleventh article, which contains nothing on the point at issue, viz. whether justification is perfect at the first moment of acquiring true faith, or becomes more complete as faith advances and ripens; the only topic of the article is justification by the merits of Christ alone, excluding those of men, and on this topic my piece was clear and full. He quotes also the Homily on Salvation, referred to in that article; yet this contains nothing explicit on the point mentioned, though P. very dogmatically affirms that it does, and that it contradicts my piece. Let him consider the title of this homily, "of the salvation of mankind by only Christ our Saviour," &c., and he will see that, like the article, its object is to assert the merits of Christ, to the utter exclusion of human worth: and surely a writing of an oratorical sort is not to be quoted for a point of doctrine upon which it does not explicitly enter. The standards of our Church leave open the particular point now under discussion.

As to standard authors: you, and P., and I, have seen such authors adduced for many and various propositions. Inasmuch as he quotes not from any of those he names, I cannot judge whether he represents their opinions fairly or not. From Bishop Jeremy Taylor I offer him the following:—"A righteous man is justified when he is saved; and a weak Christian is justified when his imperfect services are accepted for the present, and himself thrust forward to more grace; and he that is justified may be justified more"—"When the faith is such that justification is the product and correspondent, as that faith may be imperfect, so the justification is but begun, and either must proceed further, or else, as the faith will die, so the justification will come to nothing." "No man's sins are pardoned, but in the same measure in which they are mortified, destroyed, and taken away." (Taylor's Sermons, Boston edit. v. 3, pp. 68. 75.)

My piece is accused by P. of a savor of Popery. Why? Because, as Hooker remarks, the Romanist says of his *quasi* physical grace of justification, that it is "capable of increase," and I say that the state of justification may advance and improve, without symbolizing in the least with the *quasi* physical notion. Such an allegation is any thing but fair. Let the reader turn to Hooker's sermon, section 5, and see whether my piece resembles his account of the Popish doctrine. Let him turn to the whole sermon, and see if Hooker treats the question, whether justification is complete in a moment. No; his grand argument is to prove the sole merits of Christ, which my piece fully asserted, though P. would argue that its assertions on this point are worth little or nothing: how candid!

So of the distinction between justification and sanctification, let the reader examine sections twenty and twenty-one of Hooker's sermon, and he will see it allowed that "justification doth sometimes imply sanctification also with it." Then, as to Jeremy Taylor, he is perfectly clear and explicit. For example. "No man is justified in the least sense of justification, that is, when it means nothing but the pardon of sin, but when his sin is mortified and destroyed." Again. "No man is justified but he that is in some measure sanctified. For the understanding and clearing of which proposition we must know, that justification, when it is attributed to any cause, does not always signify justification actual. Thus when it is said in Scripture, 'We are justified by the death of Christ,' it is but the same thing as to say, 'Christ died for us;' and he rose again for us too, that we might be justified in due time, and by just measures and dispositions; 'he died for our sins, and rose again for our justification;' that is, by his death and resurrection he hath obtained this power, and effected this mercy, that if we believe him and obey, we shall be justified and made capable of all the blessings of the kingdom. But that this is no more but a capacity of pardon, of grace, and of salvation, appears not only by God's requiring obedience as a condition on our parts, but by his expressly attributing this mercy to us at such times and in such circumstances, in which it is certain and evident that we should not actually be justified; for so we, saith the Scripture, 'We, when we were enemies, were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; and while we were yet sinners Christ died for us;' that is, then was our justification wrought on God's part; that is, then he intended this mercy to us, then he resolved to show us favor, to give us promises, and laws, and conditions, and hopes, and an infallible economy of salvation; and when faith lays hold on this grace, and this justification, then we are to do the other part of it; that is, as God made it potential* by the death and resurrection of Christ, so we, laying hold on these things by faith, and working the righteousness of faith, that is, performing what is required on our parts, we, I say, make it actual: and for this very reason it is that the apostle puts more emphasis upon the resurrection of Christ than upon his death. 'Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again.' And 'Christ was both delivered for our sins, and is risen again for our justification;' implying to us, that as it is in the principal, so it is in the correspondent; our sins indeed are potentially pardoned, when they are marked out for death and crucifixion; when by resolving and fighting against sin, we die to sin daily, and are so made conformable to his death; but we must partake of Christ's resurrection before this justification can be actual; when we are 'dead to sin, and are risen again unto righteousness,' then as we are 'partakers of his death,' so we shall be 'partakers of his resurrection,' (saith St. Paul,) that is, then we are truly, effectually, and indeed justified, till then we are not." Yet again. "So that now we see that justification and sanctification cannot be distinguished, but as words of art signify the various steps of progression in the same course; they may be distinguished in notion and speculation, but never when they are to pass on to material events; for no man is justified but he that is also sanctified." "No man is justified, that is, so as to signify salvation, but sanctification must be precedent to it." (Sermons, v. 3, pp. 77, 80.) I do not recollect a single doctrinal proposition in my piece that is not contained in my extracts from Bishop Taylor, or may not be inferred from them.

When I argue that justification grows more complete as faith increases in good fruits, I mean in human account. I intrude not into the things which belong to God. Whenever a person dies, who is justified in any degree, he is in the hands of Him who will not reject his own work. He is taken hence when God judges his trial to be complete, and therefore I say not that *he* could have increased in justification beyond the point at which death found him. But living Christians must hold themselves bound to a continual advance in the favor of their Judge.

In conclusion, I will ask P. to solve for himself the following queries:—Had Abraham justifying faith when he obeyed the call to leave his native country? If not, why does Paul celebrate his faith in that act, in Heb. xi.? If he had, then a subsequent act of faith (Gen. xv.) was also "counted to him for righteousness;" i. e., he received justification in two distinct acts of his faith, the interval being some ten years: and this is fatal to the notion that we are completely justified in a moment. Again, was not Abraham justified when his "faith was counted to him for righteousness," as mentioned in Gen. xv.? and was he not again justified, and was not that "scripture" again "fulfilled," according to St. James, when he offered up Isaac some forty years afterward? Putting all these occurrences together, we find that Abraham enjoyed at least three explicit gifts of justifying grace, instead of one only, as P. and those who agree with him must maintain. And this is an ample basis for the doctrine that justification is progressive.

* Existing in possibility, not in act.

Dr. Parre, an eminent physician of forty years' practice, testified as follows:—

"The use of the sabbath, medically speaking, is that of a day of *rest*. It is a day of compensation for the inadequate restorative power of the body under *continued* labor and excitement. A physician always has respect to the preservation of the restorative power; because, if once this be lost, his healing office is at an end. The ordinary exertions of man run down the circulation every day of his life; and the first general law of nature by which God prevents man from destroying himself, is the alternating of day with night, that repose may succeed action. But though night apparently equalizes the circulation well, yet it does not sufficiently restore its balance for the attainment of a *long* life. Hence one day in seven, by the bounty of Providence, is thrown in as a day of compensation to perfect by its repose the animal system. The sabbatical institution is not simply a precept partaking of the nature of a political institution, but it is to be numbered among the natural duties, if the preservation of life be admitted to be a duty, and the premature destruction of it a suicidal act. This is said simply as a physician, and without respect at all to the theological question. I have found it essential to my own well-being as a medical man, to abridge my labor on the sabbath to what is actually necessary. I have frequently observed the premature death of physicians from continued exertion. In warm climates and in active service this is painfully apparent. I have advised the clergyman, in lieu of his sabbath, to rest one day in the week; it forms a continual prescription of mine. I have seen many destroyed by their duties on that day. I would say further, that quitting the grosser evils of mere animal living from overstimulation and undue exercise of body, the working of the mind in one continued train of thought is the destruction of life in the most distinguished classes of society, and that senators themselves need reform in that particular. I have seen many of them destroyed by neglecting this economy of life."

The above facts we have collected from "Critical Notices," in the American Quarterly Observer.—*Church Mirror.*